

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

JULY, 1903.

ARTICLE I.

MODERN TENDENCIES IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

BY REV. PROFESSOR GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH.D.

"Es wetterleuchtet stark in der römischen Kirche." With these characteristic words a prominent writer begins a survey of "Liberal Catholicism" in the *Evangel. Lutherische Kirchenzeitung* of Leipzig, No. 3 sqq., and thereby draws attention to those remarkable agitations that are developing noteworthy strength and vigor in so many sections of the Church of Rome and are all expressions of the inner-ecclesiastical dissatisfaction within the rank and file of the Church, both clergy and laity, against the trends and tendencies that prevail in the higher councils of the Church and in the policy of the Vatican and the hierarchy. We hear of the "Away from Rome" propaganda in the German provinces of the Austrian Empire, that has brought perhaps thirty thousand Roman Catholics into the Protestant and Old Catholic churches; of the "Former Priests" agitation in the Church of France, that has driven, according to the claims of its leader, the Abbé Bourrier, half a thousand worthy young and active priests out of the Church that has educated them; of the Biblical movement also in France, which is headed by high ecclesiastics and by learned savants of the Church of Rome, and especially the good scholar Loisy, and which demands a thorough reformation in the spirit and methods of education of the priests of the Church, insisting chiefly upon a *modus vivendi* with modern Biblical research and its results; of the "Reform Catholicism" or the "Liberal

Catholicism," that is making itself felt particularly in Germany, and of which the lately deceased Professor Kraus, of the University of Freiburg i. B., was the leader, and which insists that the "Political Catholicism" now in supreme command of the governing circles of the Church shall give way to a "spiritual" or a "religious" Catholicism that recognizes the principle of the Founder of Christianity, when he declares that this kingdom is not of this world; of "Americanism," by which rather vague term is summarized all those ideas and ideals that come to the front in Roman Catholic Church life that are independent in character and are inclined to hesitate in adhering strictly and stringently to the principles of blind obedience to the behests of ecclesiastical authorities and believe that even a Roman Catholic is allowed to do a little thinking of his own.

All of these movements, which are not only the most interesting and instructive, but also the most characteristic phenomena in modern Roman Catholicism, are not absolutely but only relatively new, being such indeed in form and in degree, but not in essence and in substance. There never was a period in the history of the Roman Catholic Church in which its fundamental principle and cardinal and central thought, namely that of absolute submission to the hierarchy, high and low, has not found opponents. In the Roman Catholic system of dogma and doctrine, the Church is the leading article and conditions the character and the contents of the other articles; so that obedience to the Church becomes the first and highest virtue of the faithful. At all times there have been those who have dissented from this principle, and this dissent has found its expression in the Middle Ages in such movements as the Waldensian, in later times in the Protestant Reformation, and still later in the Jansenites, at Port Royal, and in our own day in Old Catholicism. The causes that called these and similar movements into existence differed according to place, time and occasion, but they all agree in the one thing, that they antagonize hierarchial tyranny. In nearly all cases they further agree in this that they were not originally directed against the Roman Catholic Church itself, but were officially and honestly

from quarterly

through agitations seeking to reform the Church from within, their advocates hoping that the rule of *posse tolerari*, by virtue of which the Roman Catholic Church understands so well to adapt herself to a countless variety of conditions and circumstances, would be applied also to them and admit their programme and teachings. Only then when the Church authorities recognized in such movements an irreconcilable conflict with the principle of ecclesiastical control, the *sine qua non* of fidelity to the Church, were the innovators crowded out of the Church. This was true even of the Protestant Reformation. Nothing was farther from Luther's intention than to organize a new Church. His work proposed to be and in reality was only a re-formation, although, contrary to his original idea, this process took place not within but outside of and against the Church organization of his day.

These facts and principles are also clearly distinguishable in these various independent movements within the pale of the Roman Catholic Church of to-day, which it will be best to consider separately, as there is virtually little or no casual connection between them. Naturally we would expect that Germany would be headquarters for such agitation. The finest scholarship that the Roman Catholic Church can boast of is certainly found in the Fatherland, where there are good Catholic theological faculties at the Universities at Bonn, Breslau, Tübingen, Munich, Würzburg, Freiburg, to which list that at Strassburg has recently been added. In certain departments, notably Church history of the earliest period, and kindred branches in which the dogmatical predilections of the investigator is a factor of lesser importance in determining the methods and results of scholastic research, Catholic scholars have been doing work that is recognized by Protestant savants also as excellent and learned. But in most departments, not only of theology but also many secular sciences, such as philosophy, history, the natural sciences, the Catholic scholar is hampered by the teachings of his Church and is not permitted that independence and unbiased spirit of investigation which the highest canons and the best interests of real scholarship demand. While absolute "*Voraussetzungslosigkeit*," i. e., the

complete absence of any and all prejudgments in scientific investigation which modern scholarship often claims for itself, is an impossibility and every student in his researches must start from a certain "standpoint," and every student does this, no matter how much he disclaims doing so, yet in the case of the Roman Catholic scholar the restrictions and limitations of his dogmatical system are such that even in the secular sciences he cannot attain to such degree of independence that ensures to his results anything like reliable results. It is this condition of affairs that has developed the chief inter-ecclesiastical controversy in the Catholic Church of Germany at present. It is substantially the discussion of the question whether Catholic scholarship can be really independent and can be brought into harmony with the best scientific research of the age and with modern civilization and culture in general. To this a certain number of Catholic scholars of Germany have very decidedly given the affirmative answer, but always with a certain proviso, namely, on condition that the Church consent to certain modifications in its teachings and ideas; and the struggle between "Reform Catholicism" and the dominant Ultramontane Catholicism, between "Liberal Catholicism" and the Jesuitism that controls the destinies of the Church consists in determining what these concessions on the part of the Church must be and if these concessions and changes can be made without detriment and harm to the Church. It is seen at once that this new movement is altogether different from that known as Old Catholicism, which latter, under the leadership of Doellinger, Friedrich, Reuss and others, was purely negative in character, consisting substantially in the protest against the Vatican decree on the infallibility of the Pope as declared by the Council of 1870. On account of the negative attitude and the failure to offer positive evangelical elements the Old Catholic movement was still-born and flourished even outwardly only as long as the German government in the interests of its *Kulturkampf* gave it financial and official recognition. When that deplorable episode in the history of modern church life in the land of Luther was brought to a close by a surrender on the part of Bismarck, then, too, the best days of Old Catholicism were over

and it has ever since, being neither fish nor flesh, become a *quantité négligeable* in the factors and forces that make up modern Church history. It only survives because it has forgotten to cease breathing and is to all intents and purposes a dead issue. In accordance with this the friends of the newer movement have no words in favor of the Old Catholic propaganda, but those of criticism. Erhard, who is the present leader of the new tendency, dismissed Doellinger with the remark that the latter had spent the last years of his life in undoing the good work of his earlier years, *i. e.*, the time when he was a pronounced extreme Roman Catholic and among other things a severe critic of Luther.

The acknowledged leader of this German movement was Professor F. X. Kraus, of the Freiburg University, who died a little over a year ago. He himself, however, acknowledged that he was chiefly indebted to the Italian Antonio Rosmini, who was born in 1797 and died in 1855, who was the author of a number of works asking for a deeper spiritualizing of the Catholic Church, and especially in a book entitled "The Five Wounds of the Church," publicly declared that the three chief evils that were destroying the Church were the temporal sovereignty of the Church, the Inquisition and Jesuitism. Notwithstanding the fact that the Jesuits filed formal charges of heresy in Rome, the commission, appointed by Pius IX to examine into the case, reported in favor of Rosmini, commending his piety and zeal, and the Pope, in receiving the report exclaimed: "Thank God, who from time to time gives such men to the Church." In accordance with the ideals of Rosmini, Kraus formulated his claims to the effect that he wanted a "religious" Catholicism instead of the "Political" Catholicism that now prevails. The Church, he declares, should withdraw from secular work, and should confine her activity to the purely spiritual sphere. He recognized in the Jesuits the chief protagonists of the Political Catholicism of the day, and was unmerciful in his criticism of their history and schemes. Being by all odds the finest historical scholar in the Catholic Church not only of Germany but also of the world, his unanswerable "Spectator Letters," is the *Beilage* of the Munich *Allgemeine Zeitung*, in which

he overwhelmed his antagonists with facts and lessons from history, regularly threw the Church authorities into a spasm when they appeared, but their objective and scientific character and the impossibility of answering his arguments forced the friends of the dominant trend in the Catholic Church to gnash their teeth in silence. The only way in which it was possible to punish the fearless critic was to refuse him all Church preferences, a bishopric having been offered him as a reward for his silence, but to this he refused to consent. Protestant scholars have frequently overestimated the importance of the teachings of men like Kraus. It is a mistake to look upon them in the light of "Reformers," who are preparing to come to an agreement with Protestantism. Nothing is farther from their purpose. While there can be no doubt that they have been more or less influenced by Protestant scholars and Protestant theology, they are inwardly no nearer the gospel than are their Ultramontane brethren in the faith. Kraus himself was a true son of his Church and died in her faith and never purposed to do anything but cut off some of the excrescences that had attached themselves to the Church.

The same is true of the whole clan and class that advocate Reform Catholicism, even if such a rough and tumble protagonist as the former priest, Joseph Miller, of Munich, the editor of the "Renaissance," devoted to this propaganda, the second edition of whose "Reformkatholicismus" has also been put upon the Index of prohibited books. Miller's programme, too, touches only the periphery and not the kernel and substance of the Roman Catholic system. It is practically the same as "Americanism," acting merely for greater personal freedom for the individual and the nation under the Catholic Church; for a recognition and utilizing of modern progress in all the sciences, especially in theology and philosophy; particularly the emancipation from the control of scholasticism and the attainment of a *modus vivendi* with philosophies of a Descartes, Melabranche and Leibnitz, but only for the formal purpose of demonstrating the rationality of the Catholic system of doctrine. The latter, on the whole, he regards as true and does so almost *a priori*, even declaring that in so far as Protestantism

is positive at all, even it is really Catholic. In particular he asks for the following reforms in the Catholic Church, viz.: a better education of the clergy, greater respect for the culture secured at the Universities, participation of the laity in the affairs of the Church, the Bible in the hands of the people; but as for the rest he defends even the dogma of the necessity of an infallible office of teaching in the Church as also the infallibility of the Pope.

The most sensational advocate of newer methods and manners in the Catholic Church of Germany has been Professor Schell, of Würzburg, who has several times written books and articles maintaining that the teachings of the Catholic Church were in perfect harmony with the best canons and results of modern scholarship, but his writings have just as often been condemned by the Congregation of the Index in Rome, and Schell, as a faithful son of the Church, has each and every time "*laudabiliter se subiecit*." Hailed as a "modern Luther" when he first stepped upon the arena, he has proved a sore disappointment to sanguine observers of his meteoric flights into the higher realm of independent thought. He has even withdrawn his name from the list of contributors to the "*Zwanzigste Jahrhundert*," the most pronounced scientific organ of Reform Catholicism.

For a while at least a more promising candidate for the role of a real Reformer seemed to be Professor Albert Ehrhart, formerly of Vienna, later Kraus' successor in Friburg, and the leading light and only real scholar of national reputation in the new Catholic faculty at Strassburg. His famous work, entitled "*Der Katholicismus und das Zwanzigste Jahrhundert im Lichte der Kirchlichen Entwicklung der Neuzeit*," has proved to be next to Harnack's "*Wesen des Christentums*," the most popular scientific theological book of this generation, it having within the period of a little more than one year passed through twelve editions. The real purpose of this volume of more than four hundred pages is to demonstrate that it is the highest mission of the Roman Catholic Church in the twentieth century to reach an understanding with and effect a reconciliation between

the Church and the civilization and culture of modern times. The way in which this is to be effected however shows that the *Semper idem* of the Roman Church is to remain practically intact. He himself formulates the condition under the following heads: (1) The developments and condition which the Middle Ages have made to the life and worship of the Church, with the exception of the doctrinal developments, are not to be regarded as binding upon the church of to-day, which should accordingly adopt as the rallying cry, "Away from the Middle Ages." (2) An intelligent and sympathetic appreciation by the Church of the religious and ecclesiastical needs of the times, as these have sprung from the type of culture prevalent in our day, especially from the principles of Individualism and Nationalism; and hence a more spiritual type of religious life and the absence of all efforts to enforce the ways and manners in which churchly piety expresses itself in the Latin or Romance nations, upon the Teutonic races; and accordingly as harmonious union between the permanent deals of the Roman Catholic Church and the interests, trends and tendencies that are a reasonable outflow of the political, social and economic conditions of the day. (3) Energetic spiritual, ethical and social participation of the representatives of the Church in the departments of theology, philosophy, history, literature and art and co-operation in the spread of truly popular education. In this way the Catholicism of the new century will make itself the leading power in the thought and life of the coming nations.

The method adopted by Ehrhart in developing these ideas is chiefly the historical, and it must be acknowledged that in these chapters he expresses some severe criticisms of the Church of which he is a member, and it is these severe strictures that has caused the superficial judgment to be hastily made by Protestants that the author is really a Reformer. He openly acknowledges that intellectually and in point of scholarship the Catholic Church is the inferior of the Protestant and that there is a deep-seated mistrust of the Church especially among the educated classes and that the whole trend and spirit of modern thought and life is against the Church. His criticism of the

secular policy and history of the Papacy is severe, but he considers the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope a source of great strength and comfort to the faithful. Indeed he does not anywhere find the Church seriously at fault, least of all in her teachings; but at most and at worst in its government and wild shoots that have grown out of the healthy tree. How little he has eye or ear for the fundamental errors of Rome is seen from his judgment of Luther and the Reformation. He declares that this mighty movement of the sixteenth century essentially reduced Christendom to the state and status of the national religions of antiquity from the heights upon which it had been enthroned by the Catholic Church; further that the Reformation placed religion into the service of selfish princes and states and that too with a boldness and brutality that would disgust the careful reader; that the Reformation is in reality the beginning of a decay of real historical Christendom; and naturally he does not forget to repeat the stale prediction, echoed and re-echoed by Romish scholars for centuries, that Protestantism is being slain in the house of its friends by its theological scholars. The most favorable judgment he passes on Protestantism is the sentiment that this system has saved enough of the essence of Christianity to be still a fountain of real religious life.

But these sentiments are enough to show how little the sanguine hopes are justified that were so enthusiastically expressed when Ehrhart's book was first published. There is nothing of a Luther in him nor in others who write like him. What they are working for is chiefly or entirely a Reformation of the Church of Errors in externals. For the great fundamental principles of the Evangelical church, the formal as well as the material, neither he nor they show any appreciation or even understanding. But even what they do want they are not to receive. A formal crusade has been inaugurated against this type of Reform Catholicism, which singularly enough is headed by the very man who originally gave his Episcopal Inspiration to the book of Ehrhart, namely Archbishop Kettler, of Rottenburg. He has issued, with all the zeal of a convert, several philippics

against the innovators, and these have not failed in attaining the usual results. Ehrhart's book has not been placed on the Index, but he has been in Rome and has reached an understanding with the authorities there. As a result and a reward he has been appointed to the chair of history in the newly created Catholic theological faculty in Strassburg. This affair can accordingly be regarded as having been laid *ad acta* and Protestantism is richer by one new disappointment.

More reasons for substantial results the Protestant Church has in the case of the "Away from Rome" (Fort von Rom) movement that has for some years become a fixed and potent factor in the religious life of the German provinces of Austria, and which, according to the careful and conservative estimate of the organ of this agitation, the Vienna *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, has brought into the Protestant fold over twenty thousand converts and at least one third this number into the old Catholic Communion. This is an altogether different agitation from the Liberal Catholic movement in Germany. The latter is essentially scholastic and scholarly and has never passed beyond the academic stage; the former is purely practical, and exclusively an agitation among the people, not only without priestly advice or assistance, but virtually a rebellion against the ecclesiastical authorities. Its beginnings were not purely religious or spiritual, but rather national and nationalistic, its first promoters recognizing in Protestantism the agency that would best subserve the interests of the German element in the polyglot constituency of the Austrian Empire, and for this reason the Protestants of Germany hesitated to give it aid or help, fearing that it was only a political scheme under the garb of a religious movement. This is the light in which the Catholic authorities, who first proudly ignored it but latterly have inaugurated a formal crusade against it, still regard it, declaring that the Away from Rome propaganda is substantially against all religion and especially against the government and aiming at a union of the German provinces of Austria with the German Empire. However, the movement has developed splendidly and none but those who are prejudiced can fail to see in it a genuine agitation

for Protestant principles. It is now purely a religious matter and entirely severed from politics or the interests of nationality. It is a singular illustration of the irony of history that just these provinces, in which Protestantism was crushed out by the Jesuits in the days of the Counter Reformation, are now flocking back to the Protestant Churches. The average annual contingent of converts is about five thousand, and the prospects are that this will continue. The Away from Rome crusade has come to stay, and is only the most important of similar movements that to a lesser degree are making themselves felt in other Catholic countries. The best summaries of these movements are given in a series of brochures published by J. F. Lehmann, of Munich, in which three hefts are devoted to Austria, one each to France, to Bohemia, to Canada, to Transylvania, to Spain and two to Italy.

There can be no denial of the fact that these Away from Rome movements, especially that in Austria, considering its spread, permanency and prospects, are more or less mysterious in their origin and development. They certainly have come as a surprise even for the Protestants. As far as can be judged it is not any particular doctrine of Evangelical Christianity that has attracted these thousands of Romanists to the Protestant fold but rather a recognition of the vast superiority in spirit and life of the Evangelical type of Christianity over the Catholic. It appears also that the inferiority of the German Catholic clergy in Austria and their neglect of the higher spiritual interests of their flock had not a little to do with this exodus from their Church. The very form which the battle-cry has assumed, "Away from Rome," indicates, what is also attested by many other facts, that the repellent influences of modern Ultramontane Roman Catholicism more than the attracting forces of Protestantism were the chief factors in the movement. Of its permanency there can be no doubt, and this too is the conviction of the Romish Hierarchy as is attested by their bitter antagonism, in the interests of which they have also enlisted the state and the political governments.

The center of interest in so far as independent movements

within the fold of the Catholic Church is concerned is now to be found in France. Here it is not only the hostile attitude of the government, its policy against the orders and the church schools, that is vexing and perplexing the Vatican, but still more heartache is produced by the spirit of independence that is manifesting itself in the ranks of the clergy high and low, and that is seriously endangering the historic reputation for fidelity evinced through centuries by "La fille aînée de l'Eglise," the first born daughter of the Church. This movement, too, which is confined almost exclusively to the clergy, although it has shown the evidence of power also in the conversion of whole Catholic villages to the Protestant faith, is, like that found in other Catholic lands, a purely independent product, having no outward and perhaps inner connection with kindred agitations, but arising within the Church itself and called forth by the dissatisfaction with the conditions of affairs in that Church. France is in one respect good soil for such a propaganda, as the spirit of historic "Gallicanism" has not altogether been suppressed by the modern tendencies of Jesuitism. To a certain extent also Protestant theological research has had its influence on this movement, as the works even of "advanced" thinkers, such as Harnack, Wellhausen, Ritschl and others, have been diligently read by large circles of the younger priests in France.

The most interesting exhibition of this independent spirit, at least for the Protestant Church, is that of the so called "Former Priests" (*Anciens Pretres*), headed by the late Abbe Bourrier. It originated several years ago among the more ambitious younger priests and demanded first and foremost a more evangelical type of teaching in the Church. As a result, these men, who in the cause they advocated evinced great courage and sacrifice, were forced out of the Church, and the publication of their reasons in the *Chretien Francais*, the excellent organ of this movement, now an influential religious weekly, are interesting portraiture of religious life. Bourrier himself has repeatedly claimed, and that too in the face of the charges that his reports are exaggerated, that the number of these "Evades," *i. e.*, those broken out of prison, by which term

these men are technically called, has passed the six hundred line. In the *Bülage* of the Munich *Allgemeine Zeitung*, it is claimed that there are now fully one thousand of these. Exact statistics are probably impossible because only a small proportion of these, only a few dozen, have entered the ranks of the Protestant ministry or are now students in Protestant Seminaries, for this there are various reasons. It is not the purpose of Bourrier to bring his recruits into the Protestant Church, but rather to organize a National Evangelical Church of France, independent of both the great Churches. He himself has indeed been ordained by the Reformed Church, but he has since that time repeatedly declared that he would rather reform the Catholic Church than add numerical strength to the Protestant. In other words, his ideal is not unlike that entertained a dozen and more years ago by the learned Jewist convert Joseph Rabinowitz, of Bessarabia, who purposed too to found a National Jewish Christian Church independent of existing branches of Christianity, and naturally failed. This is no doubt the weakness of the Bourrier movement, and up to this day he has not yet effected the organization of such a body. No doubt one reason for this is the preponderatingly negative character of the agitation. It seems to be rather dissatisfaction with Rome than satisfaction with the Gospel that has driven this army of chiefly younger priests out of the Church that educated them. For that reason scores of these "Evades" enter secular callings, and many of them have seemingly lost all and every positive Christian faith. They have lost their old foundation and not yet found a better one. The chief positive confession in which at least these men are nominally a unit, is the creed that "Jesus Christ is the Mediator between God and Man." One section of them, however, takes the decided standpoint that they should unite with the Protestant Churches, either Lutheran or Reformed. The organ of this class is "*La Prêtre Converti*, and is edited by the ex-priest and present Reformed pastor Corneloup, who is also the manager of the Asylum for Ex-priests in Courbeville, near Paris, where these converts find temporary quarters until otherwise provided for. Bourrier's faction, organized since 1899 as the *Société française d'Évan-*

gelisation par les Ancient Pretres," has a similar institution at Sèvres. The battle-cry of these men is "Evangelization of Catholicism." At times they have complained bitterly of the coldness which the French Protestants have shown to them, but the latter seem to fear that the movement is not truly Evangelical and Protestant. It is a singular fact that in Austria too the old Protestant congregations too are most suspicious of the Away from Rome converts and that these people receive their financial and other support chiefly from Germany, especially from the Gustavus Adolphus Society and the Protestantischer Bund.

Still more significant although not so promising from the standpoint of the Church of the Gospel is the determined agitation of a larger number of higher Catholic clergy and professors demanding a thorough reformation in the education and the spirit of the clergy in France. It is headed by such men as Monsignor Mignot, the Archbishop of Albi, Professor Loisy, the most learned Biblical scholar in the French Catholic Church, Le Camus, Latty and others. Nothing is farther from their purposes than a break with the Church of Rome, but they certainly do demand that the old scholastic rigorism and mechanical drill common in the diocesan seminaries shall give way to modern methods of philosophical and theological instruction, with a full recognition of true results of Biblical research even if these are advanced by Protestant scholars. A formal and full programme of the proposed reformer has been drawn up by Mignot, and is entitled "*La Methode de la theologie*," and is fully discussed in the Munich Allgemeine Zeitung, 1902, No. 42, by no less an authority than Professor Rudolf Eucken. Practically the same demands are made by the Abbi Klein, in his brochure entitled "*Un renouvellement des Etudes Ecclesiastique*," and in the *Revue des clergé francais* this movement has found its learned and scientific origin. Among the recent additions to this class of orators is La Duchesne, recognized as the chief Church historian in the Catholic Church of France.

It is more than doubtful however if this movement will have any more tangible results than the somewhat kindred Liberal

Catholicism of Germany. Loisy had recently published a new book entitled "Gospel and the Church," but this has been promptly forbidden to the clergy by a special proclamation of the Archbishop of Paris, who declared that "it undermines fundamentals of the Catholic Church." Loisy was persuaded to make a journey to Rome and has now retracted "the errors which have been deducted from my book." It is simply another case of "laudabiliter se subiecit." Indeed the ups and downs of this movement only emphasize old teachings of Church history, namely, among others, that learned and scholastic agitations will never reform the Church; and then, too, that an inner-ecclesiastical Reformation is impossible for the Church of Rome. All these movements, which include also the "Social Democracy in Italy" and the "Anti-Jesuit" agitation in Spain, offer very little ground for hope for the Gospel, and Protestants act wisely in making haste slowly in bidding them welcome or exhibiting a higher interest than that of curiosity in their development. The Church of Rome never changes, and understands it in a most masterly manner to crush all manifestations of an independent spirit within her fold. In all of its affairs it proves the correctness of the statement made by a famous Protestant historian, who declared that the Hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church is the most successful organization the world has ever produced.

ARTICLE II.

THE TWO REFORMATION THEOLOGIES.

BY PROFESSOR J. W. RICHARD, D.D.

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 207.]

There is a Lutheran Theology, and there is a Reformed Theology. As over against the theology of the Roman Catholic Church, both these theologies may be called *evangelical*, because they both claim to be based fundamentally on the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to the exclusion of Tradition, and because they both maintain that Salvation is by divine grace, and not at all by human works. But these two theologies differ from each other. The Lutheran theology grows out of the fundamental principles expounded in the first installment of this essay. The Reformed theology is essentially the theology of Calvin, who has been called the Thomas Aquinas of the Reformed Church, for he "was the first to give to the Romanic Reform movement its form, its force, and its attitude."*

Calvin was not a universal scholar, as was Melancthon; nor a great religious genius, as was Luther, and was less intuitional than Zwingli; but in logical consistency and in organizing talent, he surpassed all men of his own or of the preceding generation. In a word, he was the first and the greatest of the Epigones. He was a reproducer of the highest order. When one has read Augustine, especially the Anti-Pelagian writings, and Luther, Melancthon and Zwingli, and then turns to Calvin, he finds very little in the justly renowned theologian of Geneva, that is really new in thought; but he discovers that many old and generally accepted doctrines have been deepened and clarified, delivered from paradoxes and developed to conclusions not previously reached. Pre-eminently does Calvin appear as the disciple of Augustine. In the Index appended to Beveridge's translation of the *Institutes* he is represented as

* Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, VII, 119.

quoting Augustine two hundred and twenty-eight times in that one work. In some of his other works he devotes himself chiefly to an exposition of the views of Augustine. Schaff says: "As to the doctrines of the fall, of total depravity, the slavery of the human will, the sovereignty of saving grace, the bishop of Hippo and the pastor of Geneva are essentially agreed; the former has the merit of priority and originality; the latter is clearer, stronger, more logical and vigorous, and far superior as an exegete."* Henry says: "Calvin's spirit showed itself in such a relation to the first Swiss type of theology, and to the German Lutheran form, that he was able to develop the former, freeing it from what was rude and immature, without merging it in the latter,"† and Schweizer declares that "there is not a single proposition in Calvin that does not follow from Zwingli's brief and energetic hints, with the difference only that the latter extended the sphere of Christ's redemptory work so wide as to render it probable that some heathen and some infants are among the elect."‡ Hagenbach says: "Zwingli himself propounded the principles of pure evangelical faith in several writings, which formed the beginning of a systematic theology of the Reformed Church. But it was reserved for the French Reformer, John Calvin, after the death of Zwingli, to compose the work entitled *Institutio Religionis Christianae*, in which those principles were set forth in a system more comprehensive, connected, and orderly than in the *Loci* of Melancthon."§

These opinions of distinguished Reformed scholars sufficiently indicate Calvin's relation to the theology of Augustine and to the theology of the Reformed Church. He was not a pathfinder as were Augustine, Luther and Zwingli, but he was a systematizer and developer of the discoveries of other men. He was a theologian in the sense in which Peter Lombard and Thomas Aquinas were theologians. His Strassburg editors call him *Theologorum principem et antesignanum*. In the sphere of

* *Hist. of Christ. Ch.*, VII, 540-1.

† *Leben Calvins*, II, 473.

‡ *Glaubenslehre*, II, 120.

§ *Hist. of Doctrines*, II, 432.

the theological systematizer, fortifier and defender, he was truly great; and because he has left us a complete system of divinity, we can much more easily ascertain his views on theological subjects than we can ascertain the views of Augustine, Luther and Zwingli. At least in trying to ascertain the views of Calvin we do not have to search in so many places, and to consider times and circumstances, as we do in trying to ascertain the views of Augustine, Luther and Zwingli. As proof of this we point to the last edition of the *Institutes* (1559), which was specially designed by the author to be "a comprehensive summary, and orderly arrangement, of all the branches of religion, that with proper attention no person will find any difficulty in determining what ought to be the principal objects of his research in the Scriptures, and to what he ought to refer everything it contains."* And certainly no Protestant work on systematic theology has been more widely read, or has exerted a larger measure of influence, than Calvin's *Institutio*. It has been pre-eminently the text-book of theology in the Reformed Church, and its merits have been recognized and its strength has been felt, in both Catholic and Lutheran circles. It is a great work, and can be disparaged by those only who have prejudged it, or who have failed to comprehend its depth and the logical consistency of its argument. But as evidence of its lack of originality in plan we mention the fact that it follows the order of the Apostles' Creed; and hence in a large degree it may be regarded as an elaborate exposition of that symbol which had wrought itself most deeply into the theology and life of the Western Church, and which to this day is accepted, though with diversities of interpretation, by the entire Western Church.

In the following pages we present a synopsis of Calvin's teaching on three important subjects.

I. THE IDEA OF GOD.

In his conception of God we have the key to Calvin's entire

* Preface.

system. Very correctly does Henry say: "The intensely sublime idea of God, which penetrated Calvin's soul, impelled his understanding to place all upon that point, and thus to bow unceasingly before the solemn thought of God."* It is in harmony with this judgment when we learn that Calvin begins his description of God with Exodus 34 : 6: "Jehovah, Jehovah, God merciful and gracious, patient, of great compassion, and true, who keepeth mercy for thousands, who forgiveth iniquities and sins, with whom the innocent shall not be guiltless, who rendereth the iniquity of the fathers to the childrens' children." He says that in this description Moses briefly comprehends all that it is lawful for man to know about God. He then refers to Psalm 145, "which," he says, "contains such an accurate summary of all God's perfections, that nothing seems to be omitted;" and then to Jeremiah 9 : 23, where God declares how he wishes us to know him, "as the Lord who exercises compassion, judgment and justice in the earth. These three we ought necessarily to know: Compassion, in which alone resides our salvation; judgment, which is daily exercised against the wicked and awaits them in a heavier degree to eternal destruction; righteousness, by which the faithful are preserved and most graciously cherished. When these things are understood, the prophecy declares that you have abundant reason for glorifying God. For neither his veracity nor power, nor holiness, is omitted. For how could we have the required knowledge of righteousness, compassion and judgment, if they did not rest on his inflexible veracity? And how could we believe that the world is governed by judgment and righteousness, if we had no knowledge of his power? And whence is his compassion, except from his goodness? If, finally, all his ways are compassion, judgment, and righteousness, in these also is seen his holiness. Moreover, the knowledge of God which is set forth in the Scriptures, is designed for the same end as that which is exhibited in the creatures: It invites us first to the fear of God, then to confidence in him, in order that by perfect inno-

* *Life of Calvin*, Eng. trans., II, 153.

cense of life and by unfeigned obedience, we may learn to worship him, and to depend entirely on his goodness.*"

In this chapter from which we have just quoted (*Institutio*, 1559, chap. 10) are several very notable features: There is an entire omission of any reference to the love and grace of God; there is not a single quotation from or reference to the New Testament; the object of the chapter is to give us a description, not of what God is in himself, but of what he is to us; the object of this description is to teach us to honor God with innocence of life, and to obey his will; the duty of loving God is not therein inculcated.

In the following chapter, entitled: "The unlawfulness of attributing a visible form to God, and those altogether turn away from the true God who set up idols for themselves," the author makes twenty quotations from, or references to, the Old Testament, and only three quotations from the New, and still no reference to the divine love and grace. That is, in these two chapters, which must be regarded as central in Calvin's idea of God, the fatherhood of God as shown in Jesus Christ, and the love of God as exhibited in the plan of salvation, certainly receive but scant attention. And in general it may be said that Calvin's God is pre-eminently, though by no means exclusively, the God of Moses and the prophet. It is characteristic for him to represent God as Lord, Master, Ruler, Governor, to whom absolute obedience is due from his creatures, and who directs all things for his own glory, even the salvation of the elect and the damnation of the reprobate, so that the final cause of all the divine operations and manifestations is the self-glorification of the Divine Actor. If we seek a cause for the divine conduct we are unable to find any outside of God himself. We are told that "the will of God is the supreme and primary cause of all things. By knowing this our minds are restrained from transcending proper limits of investigation. The proposition of Augustine that the will of God is the necessity of things seems harsh at the first blush." Then after acknowledging the

* C. R. XXX 72-3.

existence of secondary causes, he makes a very practical application of the doctrine of the supreme and absolute causality of the divine will: "What is more true than that God in ruling his creatures has something more in himself than he has implanted in their natures? His will is to be considered the primary cause of all things that happen, because by his will he so rules all natures created by himself, that he destines all the counsels and actions of men to the end predetermined by himself. Not improperly have I said that this doctrine places a bridle on us to hold us in modesty, because it is utterly absurd not to yield to the will of God, which is superior to all causes, unless a clear reason for this appear."* And on the following page: "You must also remember what I have already said: God does nothing except for the best reason. But since the surest rule of righteousness is his will, it ought to be for us, so to speak, the chief reason of all reasons. For the humility of faith, since it springs from a living reverence for the divine righteousness, must by no means be imagined as something destitute of reason. For who, unless he were thoroughly persuaded that God is just, and that his deeds are right, would rest alone in his pleasure? Therefore that dogma of the Sorbonne, applauded by the papal theologasters, namely, that the power of God is absolute, I detest. It would be easier to separate the light of the sun from his warmth, yea, the heat from fire, than to separate the power of God from righteousness." Again: "This will, though it depends on nothing else, is nevertheless based on the best reason, on the highest equity. For since the folly of man needs the restraint of law, God, inasmuch as he is a law unto himself, has another reason, and his will is the supreme rule of rectitude"† Also: "Since the will of God is said to be the cause of all things, I have decided that the providence of God is that which rules in all the counsels and operations of men, and that he not only exerts his power in the elect, who are ruled by the Holy Spirit, but also forces the prostrate to obedience."

*C. R., VIII, 360.

†C. R., IX, 295.

Such affirmations place the will of God in absolute sovereignty. The will determines and causes all that exists, and all that is done. Contingency is absolutely out of the question.*

As a law unto himself God is not subject to law. He is absolute. Hence it is only by didactic negation that Calvin can repudiate the *potentia absoluta* of the Sorbonnists. He whose will is the cause of all things, and is the supreme rule of rectitude, and who is a law unto himself, has absolute power, that is, a power that is not subject to the will of any other. Nothing can exist without this will in action, and every act of this will is supremely right. Where then is the limitation to God's power? And if it can have no limitation, then it is absolute. The premises will admit of no other consistent conclusion. Piety may exclaim with Augustine, "O the depth!"† But the human reason, which is the reflex of the divine reason, will not be satisfied until it finds a ground for the divine conduct that it can construe as rational. When it is told that the divine will is the cause of all things, and is the supreme rule of right action, it is pretty sure to say that this is arbitrariness (*Willkur*), and hence is not a necessary conception. It can satisfy itself that the case admits of an alternative. It can say that the will that turns so many nations with their infant children into hell, simply because it so wills, can be conceived to will differently, that is, does not will so in accordance with a necessary principle of moral rectitude. Hence it is not absolutely necessary for us "to conceive that a thing is just for the very reason that God wills it. When you ask, therefore, why the Lord did so, the answer must be, Because he would. But if you go further, and ask why he so determined, you are in search of something higher and greater than the will of God, which can never be found. Let human temerity, therefore, desist from seeking that which is not, lest it should fail of finding that which is. This will be a sufficient

* *Institutes*, I, XVII; VI.

† *Institutes*, III, XXII; X.

restraint to any one disposed to reason with reverence concerning the secrets of God."*

This, we repeat, may satisfy the feeling of piety, but it will not satisfy the intuition of reason, and reason has its place in religion, and has a right to inquire reverently for the reason of the divine conduct, and will feel itself aggrieved rather than satisfied when told that the "will of God is the supreme reason of all reasons."

Further. *"We do not imagine that God is exlex, because he is a law unto himself; for as Plato says, men are without law who are subject to their own passions. But we deny that he is under obligation to render a reason. We also deny that we are qualified as judges to render a verdict in this matter in the proper sense. Hence should we attempt anything beyond what is proper, may that threat in Psalm 51 : 4, strike us with terror: The Lord will prevail whenever he is judged by mortal man."*†

Such affirmations forestall all inquiry into the nature of God, and, taken with others previously quoted, are calculated to make the impression that God is chiefly *Will*, or *Law*. At least they make it evident that it is the will of God that determines the propriety and the lawfulness of all his relations and of all that he does and permits to be done. "The first man fell because God thought it was proper to be so. Why he thought so, he has concealed from us. But it is certain that he thought so, because he saw that thereby the glory of his justice would be meritoriously exhibited. When you hear mention made of the glory of God, then think of his justice, for that which would be looked upon as deserving of praise, must be just. Therefore man falls, because the providence of God so ordains it, though he falls by his own guilt."‡

"Whence has it happened that the fall of Adam involved so many nations with their infant children in eternal death without remedy, except that it seemed good to God? A horrible decree, indeed, I confess; yet who can deny that God fore-

**Institutes*, III, XXIII; II.

† C. R., XXX, 700.

‡ C. R., XXX, 705.

knew the fate of man before he created him, and foreknew it because he had appointed it so by his own decree."* "The descendants of Adam fell by the divine will into that miserable condition in which they are now involved."* And this miserable condition into which man has fallen, is not "by the mere permission, and without any appointment, of God." "All things being at God's disposal, and the decision in regard to salvation belonging to him, he orders all things by his counsel and decree in such a manner that some men are born devoted from the womb to certain death, that his name may be glorified in their destruction."

Such teaching in regard to the will of God is not incidental nor accidental with Calvin. It forms a very large part of the very substance and marrow of his doctrine of God, and of his understanding of the relations of God to men. The will of God is the supreme norm, the sovereign law. Whatever God wills is *eo ipso* right, is right because he wills it. Nothing can be found above God's will. "God's will is the necessity of things, and that will necessarily come to pass which he has willed, as those things will surely come to pass which he has foreseen."†

This conception of the absolute sovereignty of the divine will, and of its non-amenability to any *ad extra* condition, or to any distinction whatever, is clearly brought out by Calvin in his comment on Genesis, 25 : 29. He says that in putting the disposition of Esau to the test, and in "designing to present an instance of Jacob's piety," God had no reference to the future conduct of either, because: "Since God is the Creator of the world, he is by his own right in such a sense the arbiter of life and death that he cannot be called to account, but his own will is, so to speak, the *cause of causes*."

And yet God is not to be conceived as *extex*! But this conclusion can be reached only by affirming that God is a law unto himself,—which may be pious, but it cannot be consistently logical. To be *extex* is to be without law, is to be subject to

* C. R., XXX, 704.

† See C. R. II, 705, and C. R. I, 870-1.

no law. To be a law unto one's self, is to be the subject only of one's own will. As the will itself is the cause of causes, its action cannot be determined by reason, or by wisdom, for *ex hypothesi* they are inferior to the will. In strict logic it is the will then that makes the divine action reasonable and wise, or to seem reasonable and wise. As an article of faith, as a teaching of revelation, we may believe that the will of God is unchangeable, but it is perfectly competent for the reason to conceive the will of God to be different, or to have been different, from what it now is, and to act otherwise than it now acts. The conclusion from Calvin's premises is inevitable: The present moral order of the universe is itself contingent, since it proceeded from a will that might have been different, and might have acted differently. It is not based on the *perseitas boni*, but on the *voluntas Dei*. God chose it, not because it is the best; much rather is it the best because God chose it. But in its operations, and in its relations to us, this present moral order is arbitrary, that is, it has been determined by the mere will of God, which, according to Calvin, is the supreme rule of rectitude, and the cause of causes. Hence here it is that Calvin joins hands with Duns Scotus and Occam, who held that "God acts with absolutely unrestrained arbitrariness."*

Such a view of God may well serve to keep man humble, but it cannot satisfy his ethical reason. To proclaim the wisdom and holiness of God is only to beg the question so long as the will is the superior cause and is the supreme rule of rectitude. We instinctively seek a ground of right and wrong in the distinctions that inhere in actions themselves, or in conditions that present themselves to the agent. The distinctions between actions must be as certain, as eternal, as unchangeable, in principle, as God himself, otherwise we have only a mutable morality; and the conditions in and under which actions appear, form the necessary basis for discriminate moral judgments. God himself, we conceive, must observe these distinctions and

* See Erdmann's *Hist. of Philosophy* (English translation) I, 501. Also, Ueberweg's *Hist. of Philosophy*, I, 452, 456 *et seq.*

conditions, as a reason for his conduct, since there are things that reason says it would not be right for God himself to do, as for instance to show partiality in the bestowment of his favors, where the conditions are identical. Or, to put the case concretely, to elect Jacob to salvation, to bestow on him effectual calling, the renewing of the Holy Spirit, the gift of perseverance, and to reprobate Esau, to deny him effectual calling, to withhold from him the operation of the Holy Spirit, to devote him from the mother's womb to eternal death—all because he has willed so to do for the illumination of the glory of his grace and the glory of his justice—and then to say: "Nothing remains but that all flesh should keep silence before God, and that the whole world, confessing itself to be obnoxious to his judgment, should rather be humbled than proudly contend"*—this does not prove that God is not *exlex*, but proves rather that the words: "a law unto himself" have no meaning for us, and that Calvin's idea of God, notwithstanding his disclaimer, goes back to the Nominalistic *potentia absoluta*,† for when God elects one man to eternal life, and reprobates his brother to eternal death, and gives us no reason for this discrimination that we can understand, we are bound to say that he exercises *potentia absoluta*; and it is only by submitting in Nominalistic fashion to authority—in this case to the antecedent assumption that the will of God is the supreme rule of rectitude—that we can say that such discrimination is just. But we cannot expunge from our minds the intuition given by God himself, nor the thought derived from God's word, that justice has its most fundamental principle in impartiality. But whatsoever may be the logic, or the ethics, or the metaphysics of the case, it is evident that with Calvin God is the one sublime and awful thought. He seems almost to be overwhelmed by the contemplation of the divine sovereignty, and to bow in humblest submission to the absolute causality of the divine will, which, in its activity, extends to all creatures and determines all events, so that they occur necessarily as they do. At

* *Com. on Gen. 25* : 29.

† See Erdmann's *History of Philosophy*, I, pp. 498, 510, 511, English translation.

the same time he has a most adoring conception of the holiness of God, and for this reason, doubtless, he hated sin as but few men have hated it, and indignantly repels every intimation that his doctrine of God makes God the author of sin. But this he does, as it seems to us, by sweeping negations and bold paradoxes, rather than by consistent conclusions from the premises laid down. But as to the practical effect of Calvin's doctrine of God, we feel bound to say that notwithstanding its seemingly abstract and almost unearthly nature—a doctrine that has shocked not a little the moral intuitions of the vast majority of Christians—it nevertheless had in view a most practical end, and has been most successfully applied to the Christian life, has been a great promoter of civil and religious liberty, and has produced the very highest type of Christian morality. It was Calvin's expressed aim to set forth the nature and attributes of God strictly according to the Scriptures, and not according to the speculations of reason. Indeed Calvin was not a speculative genius, but an intensely practical spirit. The supreme aim of his theological activity was to reform the lives of men, and to improve their manners according to the divine pattern. The age in which he lived was one of moral degeneracy and unbridled libertinism. The character that was born in him was severe, and the education which he had received was legalistic. It was but natural that he should seize on the Old Testament conception of God as the most proper instrument for subduing the rude and wild passions of men. That the instrument was effective is known to all the world. Tyrants have trembled before it, and the poor and oppressed of the earth have sought its protection.

II. PREDESTINATION.

There is no doctrine connected with the Christian scheme on which Calvin dwelt so persistently, and which he developed with so much consistency, as the doctrine of the Double Predestination. He freely accepted the Augustinian doctrine of sin, grace, and the bondage of the will (*arbitrium*). But he goes beyond Augustine in extending the eternal decree to dam-

nation. It is his peculiar doctrine that "before the creation of the first man God had determined by an eternal decree what he wished to become of the whole human family. By this secret counsel of God it came to pass that Adam fell from the perfect state of his nature, and by his fall drew all his posterity into the guilt of eternal death. On this same decree depends the discrimination between the elect and the reprobate, because he adopted some to salvation and destined others to eternal destruction."* It thus appears that the eternal decree of God extends to every individual of the race, and divides the race into two classes, one of which is appointed to salvation, the other is devoted to damnation. The cause of this discrimination we are afterwards told, "is none other than the mere will of God, which is the supreme rule of rectitude." Indeed, Calvin maintains that election implies reprobation, that if some are elected unto salvation as vessels of mercy, others are necessarily as vessels of wrath reprobated to damnation on account of sin. He says: "Many, indeed, as if they wished to avert odium from God, admit election in such a way as to deny that any one is reprobated. But this is puerile and absurd, because election itself could not exist without being opposed to reprobation. God is said to separate those whom he adopts to salvation. To say that others obtain by chance, or acquire by their own efforts, that which election alone confers on a few, will be worse than absurd. Whom God passes by, he reprobates, and from no other cause than his determination to exclude them from the inheritance which he predestinates for his children. And the petulance of men is intolerable, if it refuses to be restrained by the word of God, which treats of his incomprehensible counsel, adored by angels. But now we have heard that hardening proceeds from the Divine power and will, as much as mercy."† In speaking of the vessels of wrath fitted for destruction he declares "that God's power is not permissive, but influential," and "the cause of hardening is the se-

* C. R. XXXVII, 713-4.

† *Institutes* (Allen's translation), Bk. III, XXIII; I.

cret counsel of God." And in reply to those who "recur to the distinction between will and permission, and insist that God permits the destruction of the impious, but does not will it," he says: "But what reason shall we assign for his permitting it, but because it is his will? It is not probable, however, that man procured his own destruction by the mere permission and without any appointment of God; as though God had not determined what he would choose to be the condition of the principal of his creatures. I shall not hesitate therefore to confess plainly with Augustine, 'that the will of God is the necessity of things, and that what he has willed will necessarily come to pass, as those things are really about to happen which he has foreseen.' '*

This doctrine of the Double Predestination Calvin bases chiefly on the ninth chapter of Romans. But as he looks upon the Scripture as an organism through which God expresses and makes known his secret counsel to the elect, so he finds almost everywhere in the Divine Word his favorite and central doctrine, namely, that God of his own will and without anything determining him thereto chooses some men as the subjects of his grace, and reprobates others as the objects of his wrath. Consequently he accepts the *decretum horribile*, not because it delights him, but because he verily believes it to be a teaching of the divine word and believes it to be his duty to state it and to inculcate it at all hazards. For instance in writing to Bullinger in 1552 he declared that he holds the doctrine of Predestination to be found in the word of God.† In writing to the Seigneurs of Geneva in the same year, he declares: "The Scriptures, however, show us clearly, that God has predestinated men to such ends as he chose them to reach."‡ In the Preface to the *Consensus Genevensis*, he called "gratuitous Election of God" "our doctrine which is drawn from the pure word of God." In his Commentary on Romans IX: 18 he says: "Paul teaches us, that the ruin of the wicked is not

* *Ibid.*, VIII.

† Bonnet's *Calvin's Letters*, II, 333.

‡ *Ibid.*, 367.

only foreseen, but also ordained by God's counsel and his will; and Solomon teaches us the same thing,—that not only the destruction of the wicked is foreknown, but that the wicked themselves have been created for this very end—that they may perish. (Prov. XVI : 4)." That is, Calvin finds the doctrine of the Double Predestination distinctly taught in both Testaments.

To sum up: Calvin holds that the Scriptures teach "that God, according to his own will, favors with mercy them whom he pleases, and unsheathes the severity of his judgment against whomsoever it seemeth him good."* Or to state the case in our own summing up Calvin's doctrine is that the Word of God teaches, that God from eternity, that is, before the first man was created, willed that some men, a definite small number, be saved, and willed to supply all the means necessary for their salvation; and willed also that all the rest of mankind should be consigned to eternal death, and willed that they should be left in their sins, and be hardened and excluded from the knowledge of his name that they may be damned.

Let us now follow Calvin in chronological order, as we exhibit the development of his doctrine of the Double Predestination as based on the Word of God.

1. In the year 1536 Calvin published the first edition of his Institutes. Here the doctrine of Predestination is moderately, though distinctly, expressed, on its positive side. "In Christ are we elected from eternity before the foundation of the world, by no merit of our own, but according to the purpose of the good pleasure of God; by his death are we freed from the damnation of death, and delivered from perdition; adopted in him as sons and heirs; by his blood reconciled to the Father; delivered into his care by the Father that we might neither perish nor fall, and are so inserted in him that as partakers of eternal life we enter into the Kingdom of God through him. (Eph. 1; Rom. 9: 2 Tim. 1; Jno. 1; Eph. 1: 3; Rom. 5: 8; 2 Cor. 5; Jno. 10 and 17)."† Again: "Since

* *Com. de Romans*, IX, 18.

† C. R., XXIX, 51.

Christ is our Lord, in whom the Father hath from eternity elected those whom he willed to be his own and to be gathered into his Church, we have distinct proof both that we are among the elect of God and are in his Church, if we have communion with Christ * * * We are certain that we are among those whom the Lord hath elected from eternity, whom he will always protect, and whom he will never suffer to perish (Rom. 8)."^{*} It is sufficient here to observe that election is from eternity, that it is according to the *beneplacitum Dei*, that it results from the will of God, and that it involves final perseverance and entrance into the divine Kingdom. Reprobation is not mentioned, but as election is based on discrimination, it involves rejection, and whom God rejects he reprobates. According to Calvin's own words, "God is said to separate those whom he adopts to salvation." Then those who are not separated are left in their sins.

2. In 1537 Calvin prepared an *Instruction and Confession of Faith in use in the Church at Geneva*, which in the following year he translated into Latin and published under the title: *Catechismus sive Christianae Religionis Institutio*, etc. Under the heading: *Of Election and Predestination* he says: "But in this distinction is necessarily to be considered the sublime mystery of the divine counsel. For in those alone does the Word of God take root and fructify, whom God by his eternal election predestinated to become sons and heirs of the heavenly Kingdom. To all others, who by the same counsel before the foundation of the world were reprobated, the plainest preaching of the truth can be nothing but the savor of death unto death." Why God hath chosen to make this distinction among men is his own secret, and we are not to inquire into majesty. Calvin simply says: "We recognize the elect as vessels of mercy, and the reprobate as vessels of just wrath."[†]

This thesis is supported by appeal to Prov. 25 : 2 ; Eph. 1 : 4 ; John 1 : 4 ; John 3 : 16. The Double Predestination is here distinctly set forth. If election be a teaching of the word of God, the same must be said of reprobation. In Calvin's es-

^{*} C. R., XXIX, 74.

[†] C. R., XXXIII, 332-3.

timation the two stand or fall together ; the one is the correlate of the other.

3. In the year 1539 Calvin, then residing at Strassburg, published his *Commentary on Romans*. He has the following to say on verse eighteen, chapter IX : "*To whom he wills then he sheweth mercy*, etc. Here follows the conclusion of both parts ; which can by no means be understood as being the language of any other but of an Apostle ; for he immediately addresses an opponent, and adduces what might have been objected by an opposite party. There is therefore no doubt that Paul, as we have already reminded you, speaks these things in his own person, namely, that God, according to his own will favors with mercy whom he pleases, and unsheathes the severity of his judgment against whomsoever it seemeth him good. That our mind may be satisfied with the difference which exists between the elect and the reprobate, and may not inquire for any cause higher than the divine will, his purpose was to convince us of this—that it seems good to God to illumine some that they may be saved, and to blind others that they may perish : for we ought particularly to notice these words, *to whom he wills* and *whom he wills* : beyond this he allows us not to proceed. But the word *hardens*, when applied to God in Scripture, means not only permission (as some washy moderators would have it), but also the operation of the wrath of God : for all those external things, which lead to the blinding of the reprobate, are the instruments of his wrath ; and Satan himself, who works inwardly with great power, is so far his minister, that he acts not but by his command." A little later, commenting on the word *vessels*, he says : "For the best reason then are we, the faithful, called the vessels of mercy, whom the Lord uses as instruments for the manifestation of his mercy ; and the reprobate are the vessels of his wrath, because they serve to show forth the judgments of God." He further declares that the reprobate, "before they are born are destined to their lot." But the whole divine transaction belongs to the secret counsel of God, and is inexplicable, and we are to "learn to acquiesce in the bare and simple good pleasure of God," and be satisfied with the fact "that God has

a sufficiently just reason for electing and for reprobating, in his own will." Indeed the comment on the entire ninth chapter of Romans is scarcely anything else than an argument for the Double Predestination—for the gratuitous election of a portion of the human race, and for the just reprobation of all others. The distinction made by the will of God is clear and sharp, and depends on nothing foreseen in man.

4. In 1539 Calvin also published the second edition, much more elaborate than the first, of his *Institutes*. It is thus evident that he wrote his *Commentary on Romans* and prepared the second edition of the *Institutes* at the same time. We may expect therefore to find both books pervaded by the same controlling ideas. In this expectation we are not disappointed when we come to those places that treat of Predestination, which he defines as follows: "Predestination we call the eternal decree of God, by which he has determined with himself what he would have become of each individual. For all are not created in equal condition, but to some is foreordained eternal life, to others eternal damnation. As anyone has been created for one or the other of these ends, we say he was predestinated either to life or to death. Custom requires that we should speak of Providence as that economy which God exercises in the government of the world and of all things. Our first discussion will be about Predestination. Because the Scripture clearly shows it, we say that God by an eternal and immutable counsel determined once for all whom he would afterwards admit to salvation, and whom he would devote to destruction. We say that those whom he deigns to make partakers of salvation, are chosen by his free mercy without any regard to their own worthiness. By a just and irreprehensible, but incomprehensible, decree, he closes access to life to those whom he delivers to damnation. For truly in the elect we make vocation the evidence of election; justification we make the second sign of its manifestation, until we come to glory, which is its completion. But as by vocation and justification God designates his elect, so by excluding the reprobate either from the knowledge of his name or from the sanctification of

his Spirit, he discloses to them by signs, as it were, the judgment that awaits them."*

As this is the most elaborate and formal statement and defense of the Double Predestination hitherto made by Calvin, it will not be improper to subject it to analysis and exposition. It is based, according to the author, upon a clear showing of the Scripture; it is an eternal decree of God; men are not created in equal condition; some are foreordained to eternal life, and others to eternal damnation; the destiny of men is determined by God's eternal counsel; the elect are the objects of God's gratuitous compassion; the reprobate are objects of his just judgment; the elect are called and justified in such a way that calling and justification are the evidences of election, which is from eternity; exclusion from the knowledge of God and from the sanctification of the Spirit, are evidences of reprobation, which also is from eternity.

All this, and much more, is based, according to the author, on the Scripture. Indeed in this chapter (XIV) which is very long, and is entitled, *Of the Predestination and Providence of God*, the Scriptures of both Testaments are most abundantly used. In this chapter is found the famous passage: *Cadit igitur homo, Dei providentia sic ordinante, sed suo vitio cadit* (p. 874), also the declarations that "the will of God is the supreme rule of rectitude," and that "God sends his word to many, whose blindness he wishes especially to aggravate." Here also is found an exposition of Matthew 22 : 14 : "*For many are called, but few chosen.*" There is a twofold call. For the one call is universal, by which through the external preaching of the word, God invites alike all to himself, even those to whom he sets it forth as a savor of death, and as an instrument of severer condemnation. The other call is special, by which he particularly distinguishes only believers, since by an internal illumination of the Spirit he causes the word preached to enter their hearts."

Of course the argument, or rather the exposition, must har-

*C. R., XXIX : 865.

monize with the fundamental principle that salvation is not intended for all. If salvation be not intended for the "many" as contrasted with the "few," then the call is not *seriously* directed to the "many." In reality the "many" have no call, for the call is the special prerogative of the "few," and is the *testification* of their election. The "many" hear the same sound of the Gospel that is heard by the "few," but to the "many," the "few" excepted, it is only a savor of death unto death, or an instrument for the aggravation of their blindness. To the elect the sound of the Gospel is made effective by the superadded gift of the Holy Spirit; from the reprobate the Spirit is withheld, so that they cannot accept the message of the Gospel. The conclusion is certain: The design of the Gospel call is in extent exactly commensurate with the decree of election. The call of the Gospel is in reality not designed for all men. Vocation therefore is limited and technical. It is confined to the elect, it belongs to the elect, it testifies to the elect of something done for them in eternity by the secret counsel of God. Hence he who has not been eternally elected is not called. He who is called knows thereby that he has been elected, and the call is thus the first step in the individual's experience of salvation. The second step in such experience is justification.

In continuing the discussion in this chapter Calvin quotes 1 Tim. 3 : 4 : "God hath concluded all under unbelief that he might have mercy on all;" and Rom. 11 : 32 ; and Ezekiel 18 : 32 ; 33 : 11 : "The Lord declares that he wills not the death of the sinner, but that he turn and live." He then says : "The first from the Apostle is inappositely adduced here, for it is very evident from the context that he here speaks, not of individuals, but of orders of persons. He had commanded Timothy to have solemn prayers said in the Church for kings and princes. But since it would seem absurd to offer prayers to God for a class of men properly deplored, since they were not only aliens from the body of Christ, but were striving with all their might to overthrow his kingdom, the Apostle adds that it is acceptable to God who wishes all men to be saved, by which he means only that God closes the way to no class or

condition of men; yea, rather that he has so poured out his mercy as to will that no class be without it. The other passages do not declare what God has determined concerning all his secret judgments, but announce that pardon is prepared for all sinners who turn to seek it. If now it be insisted that he will have mercy on all, I will oppose what is said elsewhere, viz., that our God is in the heavens where he doeth what he will. Hence this passage must be expounded so as to agree with another: I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion. He who chooses out some to be the subjects of his compassion does not bestow that compassion upon all.*

It thus appears that the word *omnes* does not mean *all*, but only "the some" whom God "chooses to be the subjects of his compassion." Everything is to be referred back to election, to the *discrimination* that has been made from eternity. That is, the Double Predestination furnishes the principle for the interpretation of all Scripture. If any passage of Scripture in its literal sense conflicts with the principle, which is an eternal decree, that sense is to be discarded and another is to be found. The *omnes* in Timothy means only some of every order or condition of men. The "Sinner" in Ezekiel means not every sinner, but only that particular sinner who has been foreseen and chosen from eternity to be the recipient of the divine compassion. However much the reprobate—who constitute the vast majority of the race—may be moved by the sound of the Gospel to feel the need of salvation, and may even be made to long for salvation, they are not vouchsafed the first proof of their election, which is the special call, much less the second sign, which is justification, and have already the evidence of their destiny in the fact that they have been excluded from the knowledge of God and from the sanctification of the Spirit. The *revealed* will of God is not his *true* will, neither is the revealed will the will with which men have to do, nor is the *revealed* will really the will according to which he designs the salvation of men. "God takes up a twofold character,"* and has "a double will," and in the last analysis

* C. R. XXIX : 887-8.

* *Commentary on Ezekiel*, 18 : 32. † C. R. XXXVI, 301.

everything depends upon the *secret* will, the *beneplacitum Dei*. "By his promise God wills that his compassion be set forth to all who take refuge in it. But only those take refuge in it whom he has predestinated to salvation. To these, I say, there is the sure unshaken verity of the promises, so that it may not be said that there is any difference between God's eternal election and the testimony of his grace, which he bestows upon believers. But why does he name all? That the consciences of the pious may rest the more securely when they understand that there is no difference between sinners, provided there be faith. But the impious cannot plead that they have no refuge, to which they may flee from the bondage of sin, while by their ingratitude they reject that which has been offered them. Therefore when the mercy of God is offered to both through the Gospel, it is faith, that is, the illumination of God, that distinguishes between the pious and the impious, so that the former perceive the efficacy of the Gospel, but the latter derive no benefit from it. Illumination itself has God's eternal election as its regulating principle."*

Thus it appears that, approach the subject of man's salvation from whatever standpoint you may, you always reach Predestination, or "God's eternal election," as the primary, the all-determining, cause of the difference in the future eternal destinies of men. Those are illumined who have been predestinated and elected. "The eternal decree of God, by which he has determined with himself what he would have become of each individual," rules everything. And this is the light by which the entire word of God is to be read. In reality the will of God is not in the word, and is not expressed by the word.

5. In 1552 Calvin published his *De Aeterna Dei Praedestinatione, qua in Salutem Alios ex Hominibus elegit, Alios suo Exitio Reliquit*, which, because it was adopted by the Geneva pastors, is commonly called the *Consensus Genevensis*.†

This treatise, which is directed against Albert Pighius and George Siculus, may be regarded as the most powerful discussion of the Double Predestination that has ever appeared. It may

* *Ibid.* p. 888-9.

† Niemeyer's *Collectio*, pp. 218-310.

be conceded that from the standpoint of its author it exhausts the subject. This it does by placing heavy emphasis on a certain class of passages of Scripture, and by overlooking, or undervaluing, those of an opposite character. Almost at the very beginning of the Preface the author speaks of "God's gracious election" as "our doctrine, which is drawn from the pure word of God." In the body of the work he appeals to the Scriptures about three hundred times, besides making many allusions to the same. Often he enters on lengthy explanations of Hebrew and Greek words for the express purpose of expounding the doctrine of the Double Predestination, which is the cause of "the election of the small number of believers,"* and of the rejection of all the rest of mankind, since "God had determined before Adam had fallen what should be the fate of the whole human race and of every individual man." (p. 267).

We can present here only a brief synopsis of this remarkable tractate: That we are elected, not because we believe, but that we may believe, is declared in the Preface already: "Before we were conceived in the womb, God elected us that we might be believers." As to the practical value of election the author says: "Nothing is better adapted to strengthen faith than to hear that that election which the Spirit of God seals on our hearts, rests on the eternal and inflexible *beneplacitum Dei*" (p. 223). As to the source of his argument he says: "On this subject I will teach nothing except that which God plainly dictates to us in the oracles of the Scripture. That the salvation of believers depends on the eternal election of God, and that no cause can be assigned for it, except his gracious *beneplacitum*, is shown by the words of Paul in the first chapter of Ephesians. Blessed be God who hath blessed us in Christ, as he hath chosen us in him before the creation of the world. Pighius says that the human race is elected in Christ, and that all who embrace him by faith obtain salvation. But in this comment there are two crass deceptions which are easily refuted by Paul's words. For in the first place there is a correlation between the elect and the reprobate, so that the election of which Paul speaks cannot exist except we confess that there

* *Institutes* III, 21, VII.

are certain persons whom God, as it seems good to him, has separated from the others, which thing itself is afterwards expressed by the word *predestinating*. * * * Secondly, when he states the sole cause of election, it is the *beneplacitum* which God has in himself that excludes all other causes." (p. 231). He also says in the same connection: "God elects us, not because we have believed, but that we may believe, lest we should seem first to have chosen him. Paul declares that the fruit of the divine election and the effect is that we begin to be saints. Hence those act very preposterously who subordinate election to faith. For since he sets up the *beneplacitum Dei* which God has in himself, as the sole cause of election, he excludes all other causes."

Analysing these quotations we find several items worthy of our attention:

(a). Election correlates with reprobation, and reprobation correlates with election. The two stand over against each other, and are implied in each other *ex vi terminorum*. When God elects certain persons, he separates them from other persons, and such other persons are affected by the divine action, otherwise the correlation that exists between the two classes is destroyed. Therefore the *beneplacitum Dei*, which is the sole cause of election, is also the sole cause of reprobation. God not only elects, but he reprobates; he not only chooses some to be the objects of his mercy, but he casts off others and leaves them destitute of his mercy. In reference to each class God is active.

(b). The gratuitous eternal election precedes faith. "Election itself is the cause and origin of faith." Men are elected that they may believe and begin to be saints. It is expressly denied that "God in electing us had any regard unto faith, since the same could not exist had not God destined it to us by the grace of his adoption," or as he says on the following page: "Whom God makes heirs of eternal life, them he has adopted as sons by his eternal secret counsel." Faith waits on election. "Election is the mother of faith" (p. 289).

(c). Such Predestination, according to Calvin, is taught in

the divine word. They who construct an order of salvation so as to place faith before election, and so as to make faith a cause or condition of election, act very preposterously. "To make faith the cause of election is utterly absurd and inconsistent with the words of Paul" (p. 231). The same order also obtains between vocation and election. "There is a special vocation, which so seals and ratifies God's eternal election, as to reveal that which previously had been concealed in God" (p. 232).

In this tractate also, in further illustration of his general theme, Calvin discussed the sufficiency and efficiency of the atonement made by Christ. To the objection of Pighius that Christ the Redeemer of the world commanded the Gospel to be preached to all men, he replies: "Christ was appointed for the salvation of the whole world in such a way as to save those who were given him by the Father. He is the life of those of whom he is the Head. He receives those to a participation of his goods, whom God by his gracious *beneplacitum* has adopted as his heirs. How can this be denied? That prophecy of Isaiah (Is. 8 : 18 ; Hebr. 2 : 13) the apostle declares to have been completed in Christ: Behold I and the children whom the Lord gave me. Christ himself declares (John 6 : 37): All that the Father hath given me, I will keep, that nothing be lost. That he gives life to his members only, we read in various places. That insertion into his body is a special privilege, is denied by him who has never attentively read the Epistle to the Ephesians. Therefore, it follows that the virtue of Christ belongs only to the sons of God, though the opposite party would concede to me that the universal grace of Christ can be best estimated from the preaching of the Gospel. Hence in that rests the solution of the difficulty, if we observe the manner in which the Gospel offers salvation to all. Now I do not deny that by its own nature it is capable of saving all. Only this question arises: Has God by his eternal counsel appointed salvation alike for all? It is evident that all alike are called to repentance and faith; and that to all is presented the same Mediator who could reconcile them to the Father, is well

known; but equally is it known that salvation is obtained only by faith, that that saying of Paul (Rom. 1 : 16) may be fulfilled: The Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. But what is it to the rest, except that it be a savor of death unto death, as is said in 2 Cor. 2 : 16?" (p. 254).

These few quotations may serve to exhibit Calvin's doctrine of the Double Predestination as set forth in the *Consensus Genevensus*. He finds the doctrine as stated, reiterated and defended by him, in the oracles of the Scriptures and every Scripture bearing on man's salvation is made by him to bend to the eternal decree. Christ is recognized as Mediator for all men, as capable of reconciling all men to God, and all alike are summoned to repentance and faith; but God has not destined salvation for all. The eternal decree lies back of everything and determines everything. We are the sons of God by the gracious adoption of the Father, "and the mirror, guerdon, pledge, of the gracious adoption by which we obtain so great a blessing, is the Son, who came to us from the bosom of the Father, that by inserting us in his body, he might make us heirs of the heavenly Kingdom." (p. 261).

6. We come now to the last edition of the *Institutes* (1559).^{*} In book III of this work the author devotes four chapters XXI—XXIV, pp. 678—728 to the subject of Predestination. The title of chapter XXI is: "Of the eternal election by which God predestinates some to salvation, and others to damnation." The next chapter is entitled: "Proof of this doctrine from the testimonies of Scripture." The next: "The Refutation of the calumnies by which this doctrine has been always burdened." The last: "Election is confirmed by vocation; but the reprobate invite the just destruction to which they are destined."

Nowhere has Calvin stated the doctrine of the *Double Predestination* so systematically as in these chapters. We give a few characteristic declarations: "From the common crowd of

^{*}C. R., II, pp. 31—1118.

men some are predestinated to salvation, others to destruction." "God gives to some what he denies to others." "Ignorance of this principle abates from the glory of God, and diminishes true humility." "Predestination, by which God adopts some to the hope of life, and adjudges others to eternal death." "Predestination we call the eternal decree by which God has determined within himself what he will have become of each and every person, for they are not all created in an equal condition, but eternal life has been ordained for some, eternal death for others." "Gratuitous election is only half displayed till we come to particular individuals, to whom God not only offers salvation, but assigns it in such a manner, that the certainty of the effect is liable to no suspense or doubt." As in the second edition, so in this third, Vocation is made the evidence of Election, and Justification the second symbol of it, and glory the consummation of it.

For the confirmation of all these propositions, the Scriptures are made to do most liberal service. In chapter XXII, there are not less than thirty quotations from the Old and New Testaments. A similar abundant use of Scripture is made in the two following chapters; and here it is again asserted on the testimony of Paul that election is the mother of faith, and that Election can exist only as the correlate of Reprobation. It is also distinctly affirmed that Reprobation is an act of the divine will. God not only passes over certain persons, but he reprobates them, and that for no other reason than that he means to exclude them from the inheritance which he has predestinated for his children (p. 698).

7. We add a few quotations from several commentaries. In an excursus on Predestination in the *Commentary on Malachi* pp. 471-481 all the illustrations and arguments are drawn from the Old and New Testaments. God chose Abraham, then Isaac, then Jacob, then some of the sons of Jacob, and rejected others. "The difference arose from the fountain of gratuitous favor." "The Scripture is full of proof on this subject, and experience sufficiently demonstrates the truth." He declares that the number of passages that sustain the doctrine of the Double Predestination is without end. "Our election is hid in the

eternal and secret counsel of God, and is founded in Christ; and Reprobation is also hid in the judgment of God." Finally: "It behooves us to hold fast this doctrine that God alone is the author of salvation, because he has been pleased freely to elect us, and also that he possesses power over all the human race, so that some, according to his will, are elected and some are rejected, and that he ever acts, justly and holds secret the cause both of election and Reprobation." In commenting on 1 Timothy 2:4, "who will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth," Calvin says: "The Apostle simply understands that no people in the world and no order is excluded from salvation, because God wishes the Gospel to be set forth to all without exception. The preaching of the Gospel is life-giving, therefore he rightly infers that God thinks all equally worthy to partake of salvation. But he speaks of classes of men, not of individual persons. He means only that princes and foreign peoples are included in this number."

In commenting on 1 John 2:2 he says: "Those who wished to escape this absurdity (universal salvation) have said that Christ suffered sufficiently for the whole world, but only efficiently for the elect. This explanation commonly prevails in the schools. Although I confess the truth of the declaration, I nevertheless deny that it fits the present passage. For John has no other purpose than to make this benefit common to the whole Church. Therefore under the word *all* he does not comprehend the reprobate, but designates those who were about to believe, and who were dispersed in various parts of the world"—from which it is evident that Calvin did not deny the sufficiency of the atonement made by Christ for the salvation of all men, but limited it in its design, purpose and destination to the elect.*

And now having followed Calvin at considerable length in his exposition and defense of his doctrine of the Double Pre-

* See *Consensus Genevensis*, Niemeyer, p. 285.

destination, let us note those things that have especially impressed us.

1. He is tremendously in earnest whenever he treats this subject. He never seems to wax so fervid in argument, and to become so impatient with an opponent, as when he is engaged in discussing what he regards as the first cause of all God's judgments, and that action of God which determines absolutely and unchangeably the destiny of all men. In his estimation the whole system of divine truth stands or falls with the "eternal decree," with the "secret counsel," with the *beneplacitum Dei*, and such he designates as his "first fundamental principle." When a man's fundamental principle is attacked, he girds himself for defence.

2. Calvin attaches the utmost practical interest to this subject. If he ever anywhere showed a disposition to speculate, it was not in the discussion of the doctrine of Predestination. The reality of this doctrine, as he conceived it, was useful on the one hand to encourage the elect, and on the other to humble the reprobate, and to take from them all ground of complaint. That the election of the favored few rests on the eternal purpose of God, and is signified by vocation and justification, gives assurance of salvation. That the reprobate have their doom from the just and irreprehensible judgment of God must stop all mouths. "God hath concluded all in unbelief that he might have mercy upon all; which imports that he will have the salvation of all who are saved ascribed to his mercy, though this blessing is not common to all..."* Petulant tongues must be silenced by exclaiming with Paul, "O man, who art thou that repliest against God?"

3. The conviction became strengthened in Calvin as the years increased upon him that his doctrine of the Double Predestination is founded in the Divine Word. In the *Institutes* of 1536 the doctrine receives incidental treatment, but "this incidental treatment," says Dr. Warfield, "is full enough to show that there was already present to Calvin's mind all the sub-

* *Institutes*, III, XXIV, XVII.

stance of the doctrine as elsewhere developed by him."* The doctrine is formally stated in the *Catechism or Instruction* of 1537, and is expanded and fortified by Scripture in the *Institutes* of 1539, is stated most polemically and elaborately in the *Consensus Genevensis*, and receives its most systematic formulation in the *Institutes* of 1559, while in the commentaries on the books of both Testaments it is the one ever recurring theme, and again and again did Calvin preach on the subject.† Indeed he seems to be so wedded to the doctrine that he never misses an occasion to present it, and he sees so much of it in the Scripture, that he shapes all other teaching of the Divine Word in harmony with this doctrine of the eternal decree, which lies back of the fall, back of the incarnation, back of the call, back of faith and justification—is the starting point of the whole Christian scheme, is the principle that determines the place and importance of every other doctrine of the system. For it must be understood that Calvin's doctrine of the Double Predestination is so associated with his doctrine of God as to make the two practically one. It is God who wills all things that come to pass, whose will is the supreme cause of all things. It is God's eternal decree, his secret counsel, that determines the destiny of every individual of the human race.

III. THE LIBERUM ARBITRIUM.

In the year 1542 Albert Pighius of Campen published a work divided into ten books, in which he attacked the Protestant doctrine of the will, of grace, of Predestination, etc. In the following year Calvin published a treatise entitled: *Defense of the sound orthodox doctrine of the bondage and freedom of the human will against the calumnies of Albert Pighius of Campen*,‡ divided into six books.

A part of the first book is devoted to a defense of the Reformation as necessary in view of the corruptions of the Church

* *Presb. and Ref. Review*, Jan. 1901, p. 62.

† See A. Krauss, *Zeits. f. Prak. Theol.* 1884, p. 225 seqq. and p. 246.

‡ C. R. XXXIV, 234-404.

of Rome, and a part is devoted to a defense of Luther's doctrine of the will. The author concedes that Luther had spoken extravagantly, but this, he says, Luther was compelled to do on account the false and pernicious confidence in works, which, as an accursed lethargy, could not be driven out by voice and words, but only by the clangor of the trumpet, by thunder and lightning. Luther he regards as an eminent apostle of Christ, by whose work and service the purity of the Gospel was restored.

In the second book reply is made to Pighius' charge that the doctrine of the Reformers asserts *Necessity*, and makes God the author of sin. Here Calvin fully recognizes the freedom of the *Voluntas* in the sense that it is exempt from compulsion, and acts *sponte et libente*. The natural man has *arbitrium spontaneum*, so that willingly and of choice he does the evil, forced thereto by no compulsion. But on account of inherited corruption, he always decides for the evil, and consequently can only do the evil. He affirms that man was created with *liberum arbitrium*, and was endowed with sound intelligence of mind, and with rectitude of the *voluntas*, but since the Fall the *arbitrium* is held captive under the bondage of sin. It has ceased to be *liberum*, "because on account of the depravity born in man, it is necessarily led to evil and can seek only evil. Hence can be inferred the great difference between necessity and compulsion. For we do not say that man is drawn unwillingly to sin, but since his will is corrupt it is held captive by the yoke of sin, and therefore necessarily wills the evil. For where there is bondage there is necessity, But it makes a wide difference whether bondage be voluntary or compulsory."*

He then examines Pighius' patristic quotations and shows that the Fathers teach variously on the subject, some attributing more and others less to the *liberum arbitrium*.†

The third book is largely devoted to an exposition of Augustine's view of the will. It is conceded that the great bishop of Hippo does not always speak consistently with himself. In his Anti-Manichean writings he seems at times to favor Free-

* Page 280.

† See the *Institutes*, II, II; IV.

will. But in the Anti-Pelagian writings the reverse is the case. He represents the position of Augustine to be that "will (*voluntas*) belongs to man by nature, but it is bad and cannot by itself be good. It is not destroyed by the grace of God so as not to exist, but it is corrected and converted from a bad one to be a good one" (p. 316).

This view of the will Calvin endorses. He then gives a catalogue of Augustine's works, and claims the victory. He represents Augustine as maintaining the abstract freedom of the will, but as denying its ability to do anything that is acceptable to God. In good works the *arbitrium* is not *liberum*. "It is certain that we will when we will, but God causes that we will the good" (p. 323). The *voluntas* is free, but only free to sin. The attribute of freedom is not properly ascribed to it, since it is the servant of sin. It is evil by nature, held bound and captive under the yoke of sin, until set free by Christ. * * * God gives his grace to whom he will. Others to whom he does not give his grace remain in wickedness, and are able to do absolutely nothing good, because they belong to the lost and damned mass, and are left to their own damnation" (p. 325).

The remainder of the book is taken up with an effort to vindicate Augustine in refutation of Free-will as over against the gift of divine grace. The argument is that man can do absolutely nothing to promote his salvation. Salvation is wholly of grace. "But this grace is not of such a nature as to confer upon men the power of doing good if they will, so that it is optional with them to will or not to will, but efficaciously moves them to will; yea, it makes a good will out of a bad one, so that they necessarily will the good. Moreover, this is not done in such a way that men are afterwards left to themselves, but they are ruled and continuously held fast; so that perseverance in the good as well as beginning the good is the gift of God" (p. 326).

In the fourth book the author presents very little that is new, except to explain more fully the connection between the spontaneous and the enslaved will, and the relation of spontaneous

freedom to necessity. In harmony with Augustine and Bernard he declares that "God is necessarily good, and deserves not less praise on account of his goodness, because he cannot help being good. On the contrary the devil is necessarily bad, yet his wickedness is none the less vicious" (p. 333). "God does not compel himself, but is inclined spontaneously and voluntarily to that which he does by necessity. The devil on the contrary is both necessarily bad, and acts sinfully, notwithstanding the fact that he acts by his will. Hence I think I have established my point: The voluntary is not at variance with the necessary. In some sense they are associated" (p. 335).

After quoting a passage from Aristotle τὸ βίη ἢ δὲ ἄγνοίαν γιγνόμενον, and expounding it, Calvin says: "Here we see that a heathen philosopher confessed that it is not always in the power of man to be good, yea, he cannot help being evil; and yet that which exists exists by will and not by violence. Because in the beginning he had free choice, by which he delivered himself to the service and slavery of his lusts. But this indeed is the true philosophy of Christians, namely, that our forefather not only corrupted himself, but also at the same time all his posterity, and that from that source we derive the character that inheres in our nature" (p. 336).

Again: "From the mass of perdition which was made by the first Adam, we ought to know that no one is separated, except as one has the gift which he receives from the grace of God. Whom God elects, them he also calls. Of these no one perishes, because all have been elected. But they are elected because they are called according to purpose, but the purpose is not their own but God's" (p. 342).

In the fifth book, replying to the position of Pighius that God bestows his grace on him who antecedently deserves it, and that thereafter the acceptance of grace is optional, Calvin says: "I deny that grace is offered to us in such a way that thereafter it is optional with us whether we accept or reject it. I deny that so much is given that by the aid thereof our weakness is assisted, as though something rests with us. On the con-

trary I affirm that its benefit and work are such that our heart is changed from a heart of stone to one of flesh. In that the will may be read, and that we, reformed in heart and mind, may will what we ought to will. For neither does Paul witness that God effects in us that we may will aright, but this also, namely, that we will as the complement of the work. How great is the difference between the effect and the will! In like manner I predicate that our will is effectively formed, so that it follows the leading of the Spirit necessarily, but is not merely excited so that it can if it will. Beside, what we say in regard to one deed, ought to be extended to the entire life. It would not be sufficient for God to direct the heart of man once; it must in like manner be retained and confirmed in perseverance. For in perseverance, I exhort to the observance of two things: Let us not imagine that man coöperates with God when he obeys the direction of the Spirit; nor let us suppose that a second grace is given him as a reward, as though he had merited this by nightly using the former. I do not admit that men have any ability except it be given them; and God is constantly following up his work in them in such a manner that whatever he bestows on them to the end, is of grace" (p. 353).

He then quotes Augustine as saying that "men are the work of God in so far as they are men, but that in so far as they are sinners they are under the devil." And again: "Free-will has power only to sin so long as it is captive;" and: "God shows that in making men good he is not influenced by any good deeds on their part, but rather that he rewards them good for evil, by doing this on his own account and not on their account, and according to the decision of his own will, lest we should glory in the decision of our will" (p. 354).

In the sixth book Calvin draws his arguments more especially from the Scriptures, and presents final conclusions: "In a word, I say that the *voluntas*, not by nature, that is, not by the creation of God, but by the depravation of nature, is bad, and that it cannot be different, until by the grace of the Holy Spirit it is changed into a good one. But I do not imagine that a new

work or a new creation takes place so that the new succeeds the abolition of the former substance. For I especially maintain that the will always abides as it was originally implanted in man. Hence the change is in the habit, not in the substance" (p. 379). "I say, as the fact itself shows, that the power of reasoning, which has its seat in the mind, and the faculty of willing, which resides in the heart, have been vitiated and corrupted by sin. I say that by virtue of that vitiosity, which embraces man's entire soul with its powers, it has come about that man thinks, chooses, wills, attempts, does, nothing except evil. In this sense I say that whatever is of ourselves ought to be abolished and renewed.

"I add that the *voluntas*, in its own nature so turned away from God, is changed alone by the power of God, in such a way that it has no part in the transaction, except as it is preceded by God. Augustine says: It does not go before, but it follows after in a good work. By these works I mean that I understand that there is in it no good action which does not proceed from the renewing of the Spirit" (p. 381).

These notes, we believe, present a just and fair synopsis of Calvin's doctrine of *libero arbitrio*. He does not discuss the will psychologically, as a single faculty of the human soul, or as that faculty by which the soul chooses between alternatives, and executes any given susceptibility of the soul; nor does he treat it metaphysically, as it stands related either subjectively or objectively to the powers and forces of the cosmos; but he treats it anthropologically and theologically. By *Will* he means chiefly the rational and moral susceptibilities of man. The power to perceive and to know the good and the right in their relation to God, has been greatly vitiated by sin. Into the place of the clear light of wisdom has come the darkness of ignorance of the soul's true dignity and of its duty to its Creator; and the heart has been so filled with selfishness and carnal desires as to have no proper longing for spiritual and supra-mundane things, the things that cannot be seen, but must be believed. The power of choice has not been lost from the *voluntas*, neither has the *voluntas* been destroyed, but it has been so subjugated to evil that it necessarily, though volun-

tarily, does only that which is evil. Hence it cannot do the righteousness required by the divine law. It cannot begin nor continue a work that leads to salvation. It is human nature that is morally impotent, and not specifically the will as that faculty is now understood in psychological terminology. And Calvin's whole object in this treatise is to show that man is *absolutely dependent upon divine grace for his salvation*. His argument is essentially a repristination of Augustine's doctrine of sin, grace and free-will, with this difference, viz., that he is far more vehement and severely logical than his master. But the sentiment of Calvin is expressed in the very words of Augustine: "By the grace of God alone are men set free from evil. Without this they can perform absolutely nothing good, whether in thinking, or in willing and loving, or in doing." Or: "The human will acquires grace not by its liberty, but liberty by grace" (p. 332). As over against the *gratia Dei gratuita* man has no *liberum arbitrium*; as a sinner he is *servus diaboli*. His radical disposition is wrong.

As to the merits of this treatise from the standpoint of extreme Augustinianism there cannot be two opinions. It is simply exhaustive. Schweizer says: "This book is much more dispassionately and carefully written than is Luther's *De Servo Arbitrio*, and is much more churchly than is Zwingli's *De Providentia*. In substance of teaching Calvin does not differ from those forerunners, but he avoids extreme statements, and contents himself with attending to the fact that without bluntness and boldness the true doctrine could not have been established.

"More important, according to present conception, is the distinction already established by Luther, between *necessity and compulsion*, and the exhibition of the Will as a power that makes its decisions by reflection and determination, and thus according to its very nature exhibits different attributes. For the Will is active in willing, be it in the bonds of sin and suffering, or be it free from these, whether it possesses a high moral energy, or has lost this. Calvin regards man in all moral conditions as possessing a natural will, which is never lost, never becomes a blind nature-power, nor a clod, and must always

maintain its spontaneous activity. On this basis, though not free from Luther's paradoxical expressions, he means to affirm two things: First that *everything which the finite created Will spontaneously*, from reflection and self-determination, grasps and does, must be *comprehended by and be dependent upon the absolute divine causality*, so as to harmonize absolutely with that resolved on from the very beginning by God, and which God certainly executes though without any compulsion. This is established by means of quotations from the Bible, and on the whole in the interest of a living *Gottesidee*, which regards everything in the world as animated and guided by God.

"Secondly, that *in man corrupt by nature* the *liberum arbitrium* in the stricter, higher sense, that is, the energy for the truly good, does *not exist*, yea rather, is wholly bound and subjugated, or enslaved. This also is supported by quotations from the Bible, and is in the interest of a specific view of the Christian life. Corrupt creatures are not less subject to the mighty rule of God than the incorrupt, and not less responsible."*

And now to sum up. We have presented as comprehensively as our space would allow, Calvin's idea of God, his doctrine of Predestination and his doctrine of man. If we seek for the unifying principle of all his teaching on these subjects, we find it in the one word GOD. The eternal decree of God is the absolute decree of God, a decree that has its cause absolutely in God himself, and is absolved from all external circumstances, conditions and actions, that might be known and distinguished by the divine foresight. The decree is absolute in the most absolute sense, and is secret.† Everything is as it is because everything has the will of God as its primary cause. Man's *voluntas* is not subject to compulsion; it acts of its own accord, *sponte et libente*, but it acts subject to the rule of God, and in a state of nature it acts only wickedly, and it cannot act otherwise. "Nothing is ours but sin."‡ The *arbitrium* is held

* *Centraldogmen*, I, 198—200.

† *Institutes*, III, XXII, *passim*.

‡ *Institutes*, II, II; XXVII.

in the bondage of sin. That the impious are as saws in the hand of God, which moves, directs and turns them whithersoever it will, does not proceed from Luther, but from the Holy Spirit.* The whole natural man necessarily and always fights against the Holy Spirit, and like a wild beast continually resists the grace of God. That is, every intellectual and moral faculty of man's soul, has been so vitiated and corrupted by sin, that he cannot discharge a single righteous function towards God, and cannot coöperate with God in the matter of salvation, "but without reason, without reflection, follows his natural inclination like the herds of the field."† In a word humanity as a whole has become *massa perditionis*. If any are saved from the dreadful consequence of sin, it is because God selects them from this *massa perditionis* as vessels of his mercy, while he consigns all the rest to destruction as vessels of wrath. If we seek a cause for such an act of discrimination we find it in the mere will of God, which is the supreme rule of rectitude. When we inquire for the *end*, or the *wherefore*, of such discrimination between the elect and the reprobate, we find that it is on the one hand for the glorification of the divine grace, and on the other for the glorification of the divine justice. The end is God himself, in that both classes serve for the revelation of his glory. If we inquire why it is that a few, comparatively, suffice to glorify the divine grace, while the much larger number of the reprobate are required to glorify the divine justice, we are met by Paul's exclamation: "O man, who art thou that replest against God." That is, we are not allowed to seek a reason for the divine conduct. If we point to the death of Christ, as for all (2 Cor. 5 : 14 ; 1 Tim. 2 : 4, 6), it is conceded that Christ suffered *sufficienter pro omnibus*, but only *efficienter pro electis*—the death of Christ in its purpose and design does not extend to all men. If we seek for a sure foundation of our faith, we have to find it in that election which rests on the eternal and inflexible *beneficium Dei*. "For only then are we certain of our salvation when we

* C. R., XXXIV, 264.

† *Institutes*, II, II; XXVI.

find the cause in the bosom of God."* If we appeal to the universal call of the Gospel, we are instructed that "the Lord, by his effectual calling of the elect, completes the salvation to which he predestinated them in his eternal counsel," while to the reprobate "he directs his voice, but it is that they may become more deaf," and to them "he delivers his doctrine involved in enigmatical obscurity, that its only effect may be to increase their stupidity."† If we ask why the call should be sincere and effectual to one class, and fallacious and judicial to the other, we are told that "he will torment himself in vain, who seeks for any cause of this beyond the secret and inscrutable will of God,"‡ and that "the promises, which invite all to salvation, do not simply and unequivocally designate what God has determined in his secret counsel, but what he is prepared to do for all who are brought to faith and repentance. However, in this way a two-fold will is affixed to God, though he is not so far changeable that the least shadow falls on him. * * * He has decreed to convert only his elect."§ The reprobate are already made acquainted with their doom in the fact that they have been kept from the knowledge of God and from the sanctification of the Spirit.

Thus are we ever brought back to God: Be it to the eternal decree of God, to the secret counsel of God, to the alone-causality of God, to the sovereign will of God. Hence it makes no practical difference whether we say that Calvin begins with God or with the eternal decree of God. It makes no practical difference whether we say that according to Calvin the eternal decree of God determines all things, or that according to Calvin the will of God determines all things. The distinction is only formal. Hence Dr. Henry B. Smith is right when he says: "Calvinism presents the divine sovereignty, as the principle of the system—all from God, in an analytic method,"|| and Dr. Schaff is right when he says that "Calvin

* *Consensus Genevensis* (Niemeyer), p. 223.

† See *Institutes*, III, XXIV; XII-XIV *passim*.

‡ *Ibid*, XII.

§ C. R., XXXVI, 301.

|| *Introduction to Christian Theology*, p. 64.

started from the eternal *decretum absolutum*.* Things that are equal to the same thing are equal to each other, and things that produce the same effect are in effect equal to each other.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

ARTICLE III.

CARDINAL POINTS OF THE MINISTRY.

By G. U. WENNER, D.D.

There is still room for the Christian ministry. Some of its functions have been assumed by other agencies. New and powerful factors in the world's progress have come into being. But the Christian minister still holds a commanding position in the organization of human society. How can it be otherwise? The office was established by Jesus Christ. It was held by his apostles. For nineteen centuries an unbroken line of his followers have maintained its dignity and performed its duties in the extension of the kingdom of God among men. If men are better, if society is stronger than in other ages, it is due in a large degree to the work of the Christian minister. We need therefore offer no apology for its existence. We need not fear for the permanence of the office.

At the same time we cannot disguise the fact that there are multitudes who have no use for the ministry. It is frequently observed that people do not go to church as much as they used to do. In the city this is partly owing to the exigencies of living, changes in social conditions to which the Church with its traditional conservatism has not accommodated itself. Still the trouble may not be altogether due to our surroundings. It is claimed that we have no message, and therefore the people do not care to hear us; that we preach platitudes instead of truths of vital interest, and therefore the people are weary of us. In a

* *Hist. Ch. Church*, VII, p. 547.

political campaign every cart-tail speaker is sure of an audience. He has something to say and he wants votes. With unflagging attention men will stand for hours in uncomfortable places and listen to thoughts that appeal to their interest. Ministers on the other hand, with topics of eternal import, are often compelled to speak to a small company composed of members of a limited social circle. Too often they do not understand, and are incapable of responding to the wants and needs of the great modern world in which we live. Here and there a temporary attention is aroused by a type of preaching which chooses sensational topics and seeks by meretricious means to galvanize the interest into a little artificial life.

It is frequently said that nothing is so dull as preaching. It takes but a few years for the great majority of preachers to exhaust their usefulness in a congregation, and the number of unemployed ministers seeking vacant places is legion. The minister reaches the dead line at a time of life when men in other professions have before them a score of their most useful years.

In Paul's second letter to Timothy he urges him "make full proof of thy ministry;" literally, accomplish fully your diaconate; Revised Version, "fulfil thy ministry;" Twentieth Century Testament, "Discharge all the duties of your office." This injunction was given at a time when the Church was still young, and was just setting out on its arduous path of conquering the world for Christ. It is a part of that system of pastoral theology by which young candidates of that day were fitted for a service of infinite hardship, but also for conquests of inexpressible glory. Their ministry stands out as the shining beacon of the ages. The centuries have come and gone. Periods of history have followed each other, each with its distinctive life and significance. Christianity has become a world-power. But the words of Paul have lost none of their importance for the ministry of our day. Under new conditions and with new problems, the same battles have to be fought, the same victories may be won. It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of the words: "make full proof of thy ministry."

What is required of the Christian minister, of himself, of his office?

1. Of himself, in his personal character. "The priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth: for he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts." (Mal. 2 : 7) First *be* and then *do*, is the law of life. "Do as I teach and not as I live" is the motto of a hireling shepherd. There is a subtle telepathy that reveals the thought more clearly than words. Or, as Emerson puts it: "What you *are* speaks so loud, I cannot hear what you *say*." It is the personality that speaks, words are only the echo. The higher the occupation, the more closely is the man identified with his work. While it is true that all Christians are priests, and there is not one standard of piety for ministers and another standard for others, yet standing as does a minister in the strong light of an office which he shares with Christ himself, as a shepherd of the flock, he necessarily speaks through his life. "The life of the minister is the people's gospel."

In German works on Pastoral Theology there is a chapter devoted to *Kybernetics*, the science of governing or steering. The name and the figure are taken from the Greek word meaning pilot or governor of the ship. It points out one of the important requisites of the ministry. Although we disclaim all right of external authority, there is no profession where personal power is more needed than the ministry. To strengthen the weak and to withstand the wicked, he must have a virile courage which cannot be gotten from books or from the training of the seminary.

The Apostle also enjoins Timothy to "be sober in all things, to suffer hardship." This refers to that temper of mind which takes a broad view of life, and is not easily disturbed by trifles. It is that evenness of soul which is maintained by one who has gained the victory over himself. It requires also that patient submission which accepts the path of difficulty as the royal road on which the Master trod. Christianity is not asceticism, but its greatest victories have been gained only by those who counted not their lives dear unto themselves.

Such a standard has, it is true, much that is discouraging. Who can reach it? We are already frequently cast down by a sense of our defects and shortcomings. In the clear light of God's truth we must confess that we are unprofitable servants. We need therefore to be reminded of the Gospel method of developing character. It is by accepting and bearing the image of Christ. The word character means impression. Thus we speak of the characters of the printed page. They are the impressions made by the types. In the new life of the Gospel, Christ is the type, and the Christian becomes a *character* by receiving the impression of Christ. The sun's image is reflected in all waters, in the mountain lake, in the ocean and in the smallest rain drop, but everywhere it is the image of the sun. So is Christ's image reflected in the lives of all his servants.

It is not given to every minister to be a great preacher or a profound scholar. Nor does the Master require of us tasks for which he has not supplied the gifts. But it *is* required of every true minister that he be a Christian personality, that with all that he is and all that he has he be a minister, first, last and always.

2. In his office. The spirit of a Church reveals itself in its theory of the ministry. There is the ministry of the Roman Catholic Church. It is described by the word sacerdotal. Its doctrinal exponent was Cyprian in the third century. According to this theory the minister is a clergyman, a chosen one, in a special sense *the religious person*. All others are laymen, uninformed, secular. Old as is this heresy, and strange as its distinctions seem to an Evangelical Christian, it still holds an influence over minds that would resent being called Romanists. Not only do they retain the terms clergyman and layman, in spite of the odious significance of the latter term, "when want of learning kept the laymen low," but they also willingly connive at the ideas which these terms convey. There are only too many people who are ready to take the subordinate position to which they are relegated as laymen, and to conform to a standard of piety inferior to that which they re-

quire of their minister, when they can apologize for themselves on the ground that they are "only laymen."

In the Roman theory the minister is a mediator between the soul and God, since it is the priest who in the sacrifice of the mass makes atonement for the sins of the people, forgetful of that one sacrifice which once for all was offered for us on Calvary. This is the Roman Catholic ministry. It is its distinctive position even now, and, with its ideas of apostolical succession and indelible grace conferred by ordination, influences not a little some Churches that are still within the Protestant lines.

In sharpest contrast to the Roman view is the theory of the ministry held by the Reformed Churches. This type of Protestantism is the one with which we are most familiar in America, since it has dominated its religious thought almost from the beginning.

The Reformed theory of the ministry is determined by its view of the means of grace. The ultra-Reformed confessions, the Second Helvetic for example, denied the existence of means of grace. The Holy Ghost required none, they said. The recent Presbyterian declaration has stepped across the line and now stands on distinctly Lutheran territory in its definition of the nature and efficacy of the word and the sacraments. But the great majority of Protestant denominations repudiate the existence of means of grace in the technical and historical sense.

The Reformed churches emphasize the sacrificial character of the word and the sacraments. Preaching is purely a human production, an evidence of faith, a sacrifice.

In the Lutheran Church the ministry is not a priesthood with sacerdotal functions, nor is it an office deriving its authority from its unbroken succession from the apostles, accompanied by an indelible grace conferred upon its holders by the rite of ordination. But it is an institution of Christ, developed in the Christian Church, through which the Divine gifts, the word and the sacraments, are committed unto men. It rests upon the Divine mandate. The holders of the office are stewards of the Divine mysteries. They speak with authority because they are the heralds and messengers of the King.

This conception of the ministry as it is held by us, helps to explain the secret of its influence among the people. Although we are lacking in many things, we have a hold upon the congregations which seems inexplicable when we consider the looseness of our ecclesiastical organization. Our pastors are beloved and respected far beyond their personal merits. The relation between pastor and people resembles that of a father to his children. There is no dead line in the Lutheran ministry.

In presenting what I conceive to be the four cardinal points of a successful administration of the office, I do not claim them as necessarily peculiar to the Lutheran system. They properly belong to the universal ministry. But it so happens that they are the points which our Church has emphasized and which characterize the spirit of her pastoral theology.

The first cardinal point is Catechisation. Catechisation in one form or another is a heritage of all the Christian centuries. But the German Reformation reconstructed and vivified this art and made it one of her chief tasks to instruct the young in a methodical and systematic way in the principles and practice of religion. What the Lutheran Church did four hundred years ago when she took charge of the religious education of the children and placed it first on her program, seems to have become one of the chief desideria of the present day. There are encouraging signs that the churches are beginning to appreciate the importance of a systematic training of the young in the knowledge of Scripture, the doctrines of the Church and the practice of the Christian life.

In secular schools methods of instruction have greatly advanced. In the philosophy and the materials of education high standards are set in our public schools and colleges. It is inconceivable that the Church, which has always been the mother of culture, should for her truths permanently remain content with a lower standard, a standard which at the present time invites the well-deserved contempt of the pedagogue.

Happy will it be for us as ministers when we come to recognize that it is an important function of our office to be educa-

tors, to be teachers. The period of fragmentary, unsystematic and unsatisfactory instruction in religion will then be relegated to the nineteenth century, and the new century will see the churches practicing methods of education worthy of the great objects that are to be attained.

The second cardinal point is Preaching. The Church of today is called upon to face new and great problems. But no longer, as in times past, does her message reach a friendly and sympathetic environment. It is not so much a hostile world by which she is surrounded as an indifferent one. The feeling is one of contempt rather than of hatred. The Church and her work are too insignificant to call forth a feeling of enmity.

And yet that world, even in its seeming indifference, is moaning and crying out for the living God. If it is to be reached and helped, it must be by the voice of God's prophets, by the preachers of his word. The office of the preacher is still what the Apology declares it to be, the greatest office of the Church.

It is sometimes charged that in respect to efficiency and quality, sermons are not what they were in the middle or earlier part of the nineteenth century. Be that as it may, it is enough if they have not advanced. Too many of our sermons are but reproductions of those that were preached a generation ago, good enough for those times, but no longer able to reach the heart of the present day. It is a legitimate demand that the old truth should be preached in new forms. But this should not lead us into the folly of adopting methods which are simply intended to catch the crowd. The true preacher will never forget that he is a mouthpiece for the word of the Lord. "Garrulity in the pulpit does not convey the faith," said Jerome. "Among a hundred sermons which I have heard in recent times," said the president of Chicago University, "there was not one in which the preacher made the impression that he felt it his chief duty to expound the word of God."

Instead therefore of following those types of preaching which are intended to popularize the pulpit but which cheapen it even in the estimation of the public, may we not accept the funda-

mental principle of the Lutheran Church in regard to the office of the ministry, and emphasize the sacramental character of preaching. New forms indeed let us find, fresh adaptation let us seek, but let it be more and more an exposition of that Divine revelation which has been given to us in the Holy Scriptures.

The third cardinal point is the Liturgy. The emphasis which Protestantism placed upon preaching, upon doctrine, was just. But the congregation cannot always remain in the position of a pupil. It is to be a worshiping congregation. With marvellous tact the fathers of the Lutheran Reformation retained the principles and the elements of the church liturgy so that there belongs to our historical inheritance a treasure of unspeakable value in her orders of service. Other churches in a struggle to attain the utmost simplicity, make their sanctuaries lecture rooms in which one man is the teacher and the rest are learners. But grown-up people get tired of going to school all the time.

The Lutheran Church recognizes the two-fold nature of the service, its sacramental and its sacrificial character. In the word and the sacraments the Lord draws nigh unto us. This is sacramental. In the hymns and prayers, in many beautiful forms and delightful harmonies, the Church draws nigh unto Him. This is sacrificial. Her liturgy is flexible and free, but rich and impressive and full of edification. The devout congregation that has learned to know the meaning of these forms, finds in their use a heaven on earth and with the Psalmist declares "How amiable are thy tabernacles oh Lord of hosts."

But while the Lutheran Church has summoned all the arts to aid in the promotion of worship, she has no sympathy with the spirit which allows art and external forms to take the place of worship. The tendency to copy the frills and decorations of other churches for artistic reasons only, will have but a brief tenure of existence with us, because of the rugged and wholesome doctrinal life which pulsates in our veins.

There was a period in our history, it was the time of the Babylonian Captivity, when the liturgy was ignored. It had entirely disappeared from our sanctuaries. That time was the eighteenth century in Europe. In America it extended down

to within the memory of men now living. But there is no longer any reason for remaining ignorant of one of the chief glories of our Church, and of one of the most helpful agencies of the Christian ministry. We are not ritualists in the vulgar acceptation of the term, but we do believe that the holy services should be conducted *rite*, that is "decently and in order," and in the right administration of the sacraments and the proper conduct of the services of the Lord's house, a minister fulfills one of his most important functions.

Liturgy in itself is not worship, but as Loehe says, "it is a fruit of the inner life and like all good fruit it makes him who tasted its sweetness long for more."

There is a legitimate field in all the churches for the cultivation of better forms and principles of worship without in any way interfering with the strength and the spirituality of the service. Only the work must be done in a conservative and historical manner, and with the presumption that art is the hand-maiden and not the mistress of religion.

The fourth cardinal point in the work of the ministry is the Care of Souls. The art of arts it was called by Gregory; the most precious jewel in the office of the ministry by Spenser. This work may be described in general as the pastoral care and direction of the members of the Church. It is to feed the flock and to watch over each individual member of the same. Teaching and preaching and the liturgy, have each their important place, but the climax of the work is the cure of the individual soul. It was the ancient custom of our Church to make a personal and individual application of the Gospel to each communicant. It differed from auricular confession, was entirely voluntary, and for young and inexperienced persons must have been very helpful. I admit the difficulties of the method for our times, but I would ask, what is there in the time-wasting, shoe-destroying method of house-to-house visitation, which so often degenerates into a mere social call, that can take the place of that solemn method of our fathers.

But a wise pastor will still find ways of reaching the individual soul even under the changed condition of modern times, if only it is his aim to do so.

But to fulfill our ministry, we must do more than care for the individual soul. Men are living in masses. Here in New York they live in herds and in hives. A minister must meet not only the spiritual wants of the individual but also of the community. Who that sees the neglected masses of our great cities, and equally neglected heathen of the scattered rural communities, does not feel that there is a legitimate use for the term Social Christianity. If we would in any effective way solve the problems which these needs present we must be able to call to our aid a great company of other Christians, as deacons or deaconesses or helpers under any other name to coöperate with us in this work of caring for souls. The one-man-ministry method, which prevails in so many of our Protestant Churches, is confessedly inadequate. When the multitudes who were as sheep without a shepherd stood before the Saviour, the disciples said "they have nothing to eat." The Master replied give ye them to eat. By inspiring others to do the work, we shall multiply ourselves and do much to "accomplish fully our diaconate."

It is a great thing to be a minister. With many drawbacks and trials it has compensations a thousand-fold for him who is capable of receiving them.

He lives in an intellectual atmosphere which is full of inspiration. His fraternal relation to his brethren in the ministry, the members of the apostolical college, gives warmth and strength to his soul. The love and affection of his flock, the sympathetic response of the people to one whom they have learned to trust and to follow is a priceless gift. The high ethical, social and religious aims, which he necessarily sets before him in the daily fulfillment of his tasks, ennoble him; so that whatever view we may have of the effects of ordination, an indelible character is impressed on the holders of the office.

Yet all of these are but as dust and ashes, a fading leaf or a vanishing vapor compared with the one privilege of being the undershepherds of the Great Shepherd of the sheep.

ARTICLE IV.

THE CHRISTIAN VIEW OF GOD AND THE WORLD, AS CENTERING IN THE INCARNATION.*

BY T. F. DORNBELASER, D.D.

"Jesus Christ is the Centre of all, and the goal to which all tends."—PASCAL.

"In no case can true reason and a right faith oppose each other."—COLERIDGE.

These lectures of Dr. Orr aim at the exhibition and rational vindication of what is called the "Christian View of the World."

This expression calls for some explanation. In German Theology the words—"Weltanschauung" and "Weltansicht" are frequently used, meaning literally "World-view," or "View of the World."

In German it is a technical term, denoting the widest view which the mind can take of things as a whole from the standpoint of some particular philosophy or theology. "A Christian View of the World," therefore, implies that Christianity has its own point of view of nature and life, and when fully developed, constitutes a well-ordered and harmonious *Weltanschauung*.

The opposition which Christianity encounters to-day is no longer confined to special doctrines or points of conflict with the natural sciences—but extends to the whole system of things, natural and moral, of which we form a part. It is the Christian view in general which is attacked.

Everything depends on the view we take of Christianity itself. The lecturer assumes the true divinity as well as the true humanity of Jesus Christ; and in the course of his discussion

* This is a synopsis of the able and scholarly Lectures delivered in 1891 by James Orr, D.D., Professor of Church History in the United Presbyterian College, Edinburgh, Scotland.

he proposes to vindicate that assumption. He who accepts Jesus Christ as the divine Son of God is committed to much else besides. He is committed to a view of God, of man, of sin, of redemption, of human destiny, as is found only in Christianity.

This forms a "Weltanschauung" or "Christian View of the World," which stands in marked contrast with theories wrought out from a purely philosophical or scientific standpoint.

This author reviews the philosophy of Kant which has entered largely into modern thought. In his *Pure Reason*, Kant derives what he chooses to call "Weltbegriff," and "Weltganz," by which he brings into systematic connection all our experiences into a unity of a world-whole, in time and space.

The Pythagoreans developed a new type of world-view, by which they attempted to explain the universe as a system by the help of some elementary principles, water, air, etc., accompanied by the use of terms which imply the conception of an All or Whole of things. (*Τα Παντα Κόσμος.*)

Lucretius in his famous poem *De Rerum Natura*, proposes to open up a system of first beginnings of things, out of which nature gives birth to all things, their increase and nourishment, and into which nature likewise resolves them back after their destruction. By the aid of certain first principles, atoms, protoplasm, and of certain assumed laws of motion and development, he seeks to account for the existing universe. This is his "Weltanschauung"—the progeny of which is seen in the materialistic systems of the present day. The philosophy of Comte is a modern example of pure phenomenalism. Comte's standpoint is that of despair of absolute knowledge. Yet he recognizes the tendency in the mind which prompts it to organize its knowledge into a complete system. If it be the case, as the Agnostic affirms, that light absolutely fails us on questions of origin, cause, and end, what conception of life then remains? Assuming that no higher origin for life and mind can be postulated than matter and force, what revision is necessary of current conceptions, of private morality and of social duty? The tendency to the formation of world-systems,

or general theories of the universe, was never more powerful than at the present day. One cause of this is the feeling which modern science itself has done so much to engender, of the unity which pervades all orders of existence. The Old Polytheism, when every hill and fountain was supposed to have its special divinity, is no longer possible with the modern notions of the unity and coherence of the universe. Everywhere, men agree that the universe is one—one set of laws holds the whole together—one order reigns through all. The philosophy of Spencer, Hegel, and other evolutionists, is an attempt at the unification of all existing phenomena of nature, history or mind, into one harmonious system. What has Christianity to do with theories of this sort? As a doctrine of salvation, perhaps, not much, but in its logical consequences a great deal.

Christianity, it is granted, is not a scientific system, but it must be reconcilable with all that is proven true in the results of science.

It is a philosophy, but it will be found to be in harmony with all sound reason.

It is a religion, based on divine Revelation. But it must also have its own peculiar interpretation of the facts and on-goings of nature. It need not be denied, that between the "Christian View of the World," and the "Materialistic Views" there exists a deep and radical antagonism.

The systems opposed to Christianity are as exclusive often, of one another as they are of Christianity, but in spite of their differences and antagonisms, they are united in their thorough-going opposition to the supernatural, they refuse to recognize anything in nature, life, or history, outside the lines of natural development.

The question is not about isolated "miracles," but about the whole conception of Christianity—what it is, and whether the supernatural does not enter into the very essence of it?

The question is, Is there anything supernatural in the universe?

Neander gives admirable expression of the conception of

Christianity which is at stake. "Now we look upon Christianity not as a power that sprung up out of the hidden depths of man's nature, but as one that descended from above, when heaven opened itself anew to man's long alienated race; a power which, as both in its origin and its essence is exalted above all that human nature can create out of its own resources, was designed to impart to that nature new life, and to change it in its inmost principles."

According to an old legend, truth was torn limb from limb, and her members scattered to the four winds. Ever since the lovers of truth, imitating the careful search of Isis for the body of Osiris, have been engaged in gathering together the severed parts into a perfect whole.

Every system of thought that has held wide sway over the minds of men, has some truth in it, although it may be perverted and misapplied. Christianity, so to speak, sifts the truth out of all these false systems and brings them into harmony with the higher revelation of the truth as it is in Jesus.

The agnostic affirms that there is in God that which transcends finite comprehension.

Christianity does the same.

Pantheism affirms the absolute immanence of God in the world. Christianity does the same.

Deism asserts his transcendence over nature and accepts the divine personality of God.

Christianity does all this and more.

Even the Old Polytheism is a witness for a truth which a hard Monotheism, such as Judaism and Mohammedanism, ignores—namely, that God is plurality as well as unity, that in Him there is a manifoldness of life and a diversity of power as expressed in the word *Elohim*.

Optimism and Pessimism are another pair of contrasts—each in its abstract an error, yet each a witness for a truth which the other overlooks, and Christianity is the reconciliation of both. And lastly *positivism* is a very direct negation of Christianity, yet in its strange worship of humanity it stretches across the gulf and touches hands with a religion

which meets the cravings of the heart of the *human* in God as realized in the *Incarnation*.

While the Christian religion embraces feeling and experience, it also requires intelligent knowledge, and a clear statement of doctrine.

The religion of Jesus exalts, as no other, the office of teaching. In pagan religions the doctrinal element is at a minimum—the chief thing there is the performance of a ritual.

In this Christianity differs from all others—it contains doctrine—it comes to men with definite, positive teaching; it claims to be the truth that is essential to salvation.

In the lectures of Prof. Orr, the following propositions, setting forth the Christian view of the Universe, are maintained and defended.

1. There is a Personal, Ethical, Self-revealing God. As a system of Theism, Christianity is opposed to Atheism, Agnosticism, Pantheism, or mere Deism.
2. We affirm the immanent presence of God in the World, His transcendence over it, and his holy and wise government of it for moral ends.
3. We affirm the spiritual nature and dignity of man—his creation in the divine image, and destination to bear the likeness of God in a perfected relation of sonship.
4. We assert the fact of sin and disorder in the world. The disobedience of our first parents, was not a *rise*, but a fall from their primitive innocence and purity.
5. We affirm the historical self-revelation of God to the patriarchs and prophets—bringing to light the gracious purpose of the World's Redemption through Jesus Christ—the new Head of humanity—the second Adam.
6. We affirm that Jesus Christ was the Eternal Son of God—a truly *divine person* who in the fullness of time took upon Him our humanity and was truly God manifest in the flesh. This is the transcendent mystery of godliness.
7. As already stated, the Incarnation occupies the central place in the Christian system.
 - (a) It sheds light on the nature of God, and reveals Him as Father, Son and Spirit—one God, and Father of us all.

- (b) It sheds new light on the work of creation.
- (c) It sheds new light on the nature and destiny of man.
- (d) It sheds new light on the purpose of God in the creation and redemption of men.

Keeping in mind that the Incarnation is the central point in the Christian view, the author, in the second Lecture, treats of the alternatives which are historically presented to us if this doctrine is rejected.

In the third, fourth and fifth Lectures, he considers in order the three postulates of the Christian View—God, Nature and Man, and *Sin*.

The sixth Lecture is devoted to the Incarnation itself, and the seventh to the consideration of some related topics—the higher Christian Concept of God, and the relation of the Incarnation to the plan of the world. The eighth Lecture treats of the Incarnation and Redemption from sin, and the concluding Lecture treats of the Incarnation and human destiny.

THE CHRISTIAN VIEW AND ITS ALTERNATIVES.

The author reasserts that the central point in the Christian View of the World is the truly divine Person of Jesus Christ—the Son of God made flesh. He admits that the issues involved in this assumption are stupendous.

No one will dispute, that, if Jesus is what the creeds declare Him to be—an Incarnation of the Divine, His Person is necessarily central in His own religion, nay, in the universe.

Christianity is described as the religion of the Incarnation. "In Him alone" says Feuerbach, "is concentrated the Christian religion."

Quite logically, from his point of view, Strauss draws the conclusion that, since the Incarnation is untenable, Christianity falls to the ground with it. The best theology in Germany, since Schliermacher, has been Christological.

Christ sustains a different relation to His religion from that of ordinary founders of religion to the faiths they have founded; in Him there was a peculiar union of the Divine and human.

It is only outside the circles of really influential theology that we find a reversion to the loose deistic conception of

Christ as simply a Prophet or moral Teacher, like Moses, Confucius, or Buddha.

In his argument the author appeals to the history of the Church as a defence of the Christian doctrine of Christ.

Humanitarian and other partial or intermediate views of Christ have arisen from time to time and are still reiterated in some quarters. But like the intermediate species of plants and animals, of which Mr. Darwin speaks, they are invariably driven to the wall in their struggle for existence. The *Arian View* has appeared again and again in the history of the Church in times of spiritual decadence.

In this view a lofty supernatural dignity is assigned to Christ. He is a sort of supreme angel, God's First born, His instrument in the creation of the world, etc. But He is not eternal; He is not a part of the Divine Essence. It is safe to say that this view is now practically extinct. It perished through its own inherent weakness.

The Socinian or Unitarian View—of the Priestly and Channing type—is another of those intermediate views which history may be said to have eliminated.

Christ, according to this view, is the greatest of inspired teachers, a true Prophet. He had a divine mission. He wrought miracles in confirmation of his doctrine. He rose from the dead. He is expected to return to judge the world. A considerable halo of the supernatural about Christ was retained by Priestly and Channing.

But Unitarianism began to purge itself of all the Supernatural features in the portrait of Christ, and descended to the level of mere humanitarianism—that Christ is a *great man*, a religious genius of the first rank.

To maintain their position they must either believe more or less. The only alternative to Christ's true divinity is pure humanitarianism.

And from humanitarianism the logical trend is to Agnosticism. This is just what the most logical minds that have rejected Supernatural Christianity are doing in our day.

Agnosticism is not a state in which the mind of an intelli-

gent being can permanently rest. It is a condition of suspense—a confession of ignorance—an abdication of thought on the higher subjects. The mind cannot remain in this neutral, passive attitude.

It will press on perforce to one or other of the views which present themselves as alternatives—either to Theism or to Materialism, or to bald Atheism.

The denial of Christ's divinity leads ultimately to Nihilism and Pessimism.

Voltaire is a striking example. Among his later utterances is the following :

"Strike out a few sages, and the crowd of human beings is nothing but a horrible assemblage of unfortunate criminals, and the globe contains nothing but corpses. I tremble to have to complain once more of the Being of beings, in casting an attentive eye over this terrible picture. I wish I had never been born."

Thus the last utterance of blatant infidelity is a *groan*.

THE THEISTIC POSTULATE.

Christianity is a theistic system ; that is the first postulate, the personal, ethical, self-revealing God.

Paul, "For the invisible things of Him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even His eternal power and Divinity, that they may be without excuse."

"It is easy for the fool, especially the learned and scientific fool, to prove that there is no God, but, like the murmuring sea, which heeds not the scream of wandering birds, the soul of humanity murmurs for God, and confutes the erudite folly of the fool by disregarding it."

"Volkmar has remarked that of monotheistic religions there are only three in the world, the Israelitish, the Christian and the Mohammedan ; and the last is derived from the other two. Christianity is the blossom and fruit of the true worship of God in Israel, which has become such for all mankind."

This limitation of Monotheism in religion to the peoples who have benefitted by the Biblical teaching on this subject, suggests its origin from a higher than human source, and refutes the contention of those who would persuade us that the monotheistic idea is the result of a long process of development through which the race necessarily passes, beginning with Fetishism, or perhaps Ghost-worship, mounting to Polytheism, and ultimately subsuming the multitude of Divine Powers under one all-controlling will.

It will be time to accept this theory, when, outside the line of the Biblical influence, a single nation can be pointed to which has gone through these stages, and reached this goal.

If God is a reality, the whole universe rests on a supernatural basis. A supernatural presence pervades it; a supernatural power sustains it; a supernatural will operates in the forces; a supernatural wisdom appoints its ends.

It is the Bible and the Bible alone, which has made monotheism the possession of the world.

The unity of God was declared on the soil of Israel long before science and philosophy had the means of declaring it. If the idea of God is to be entertained by intelligent people, it can only be in the form of Monotheism. The Agnostic will grant us this much. Every Theist is, by a rational necessity, a Monotheist.

Polytheism has practically ceased to exist in the civilized world.

THE CHRISTIAN VIEW OF THE WORLD IN REGARD TO NATURE AND MAN.

"Man is neither the master nor the slave of nature; he is her interpreter and living word. Man consummates the universe, and gives a voice to the mute creation."

The Christian doctrine of God carries with it the Christian doctrine of man.

How should man know that there is a personal, ethical, self-revealing God, unless he were himself rational and moral, a spiritual personality?

The natural kinship between the human spirit and the Divine is in perfect accord with the inspired declaration, that "man is made in the image of God."

Dr. Dorner says: "The absolute personality of God, and the infinite value of the personality of man, stand and fall with each other."

This likeness is implied in the nature of sin, and in regeneration. For the spirit of God finds in man a capacity for his indwelling, a kindred soul with which to hold communion.

If there were not already a God-related element in the human spirit, before conversion, no subsequent act of grace could confer on man the dignity of *sonship*. But accepting this likeness in God and man, it prepares the way for the *Incarnation*, the perfect union and communion of the Divine and human nature in Jesus the *Christ*.

To get a knowledge of the true essence of anything, we do not look at its ruder and less perfect specimens, but at what it is at its best. Christ is the best of humanity. He is not only the revelation of God to humanity, but the revelation of humanity to itself.

Man in scripture and science is the highest being in nature. Nature exists with supreme reference to him.

In a three fold respect is man the personal image of His maker.

1. He bears the rational image of God.
2. He bears the moral image of God.
3. He bears the image of God in his deputed sovereignty over the creatures of *earth*.
4. He also resembles God in the potential infinitude of his nature.

In the deepest depths of man's thoughts and desires the fact develops itself to man's consciousness, that the scale of his being is too large for this present existence.

Hence we accept the doctrine of man's immortality. The author presents a strong argument in favor of immortality from the Old Testament Scripture, fully corroborated in the New Testament.

THE CHRISTIAN VIEW OF SIN IN THE WORLD.

Christianity is the religion of Redemption. Sin consists in the revolt of the creature will from its allegiance to the Sovereign will of God, and the setting up of a false independence.

The author refutes the false theories of sin. Sin involves *guilt*, and must be atoned for by a being higher and purer than man himself.

The author denies the theory that man in his primeval state was a miserable, half-starved, naked savage; that he emerged from the bestial condition, torn with fierce passion and fighting his way upward among his compeers with low-browed cunning.

The adversaries of the Christian faith say that science contradicts the Bible view of man's origin. As it is sometimes put, the doctrine of Redemption rests on the doctrine of the Fall, and the doctrine of the Fall rests on the third chapter of Genesis. "But science has exploded the third chapter of Genesis," say the critics, "and therefore the whole structure falls to the ground."

"I acknowledge the issue," says the author, "but it is not rightly put to say that the doctrine of the Fall rests on the third chapter of Genesis."

The Christian doctrine does not rest alone on the scripture narrative, but it rests on the reality of the sin and guilt of the world, which would remain facts though the third chapter of Genesis had never been written.

Evolutionists have not proved that man began his existence as a savage, but a few degrees removed from the brutes. If it were proven, it would profoundly modify our whole conception of the Christian system.

The missing link between man and brute has long been sought but never been found.

Prof. Dana says: "No remains of fossil man bear evidence to less perfect erectness of structure than in civilized man, or to any nearer approach to the ape in essential characteristics. If the links ever existed, their annihilation, without trace, is so extremely improbable that it may be pronounced impossible. Until some are found, science cannot assert that they ever ex-

isted." Virchow in 1879 said: "On the whole, we must readily acknowledge that all fossil type of a lower human development is absolutely wanting."

No new facts, says the author, have been discovered, requiring a modification of these statements.

THE INCARNATION OF GOD IN CHRIST.

This is the culmination of the argument of Dr. Orr. Why is it that we cannot rest in a conception of Christ as simply a prophet of a higher order, or as an ideal man?

It is because the sum total of the facts of Christianity refuse to square with any humanitarian view, but compel us to accept the higher conception of the God-man as set forth in history and Revelation.

Is it believable that in this son of a carpenter, God actually became incarnate?

Some may say, it is incredible. But let us see what some of these sceptics concede.

Schleiermacher declares, that Christ is the ideally perfect man in whom the God-consciousness finds its fullest expression. Lipsius and Pfleiderer also acknowledge him to be religiously the greatest genius of the race, the only sinless personality.

This is conceding a great deal when we consider his lowly origin, and his mean historical environment. But the sceptical evolutionist cannot believe that in this lowly man of Nazareth reside the potentialities of Divinity.

But what does he ask us to believe?

He goes back to the first dawn of life and pointing to a speck of protoplasm, bids us believe that *there* lies wrapped up, only waiting for development, the promise and potency of all vegetable, animal and human life. In that first germ-cell lies enfolded not only the genius of a Dante, a Shakespeare, and a Milton, but also the superlative greatness and holiness of Christ himself.

"I confess," says the author, "that there is not much to choose between these two theories, in point of strangeness." The question must be brought to the test of *facts*. (1). Godet

says in his commentary on John, "Christianity is entirely based upon Christ's consciousness of himself, and it is the heroism of faith to rest upon the extraordinary testimony which this being gave of himself."

This must be so, for the reason which Christ himself gives, that he alone has the knowledge which qualifies him to give a true estimate of himself. "For I know," said he to the Jews, "whence I came, and whither I go." The testimony of the Apostolic Age is next referred to.

Men say that Buddha also was raised to the rank of divinity by his followers, though he himself made no such claim. The cases are not parallel. It was long centuries after his death, and within limited circles, that Buddha was regarded divine; but one short step takes us, from the days when Christ himself lived and taught on earth, into the midst of a Church, founded by his Apostles, which in all its branches worshiped and adored him as the veritable Son of God.

The consentient view of Christ's Person, in the Apostolic Church, is strong evidence for believing that Christ laid claim to divine attributes.

It is not disputed that, in the first age of Christianity, Christ was universally regarded as one who had risen from the dead, ascended on high, and would return to judge the quick and the dead.

These facts are acknowledged in every book of the New Testament. It is evident, therefore, that, in the faith of the early Church, Christ was no mere man, but a supernatural Personage.

There is a general agreement among impartial exegetes as to the nature of the doctrine of Christ's person. The old Unitarian perversions of passages which seemed to affirm the Divinity of Christ are now seldom met with. It is no longer disputed by any competent authority that, in Paul and John, it is the supernatural view of Christ's person that is given. In keeping with the character and with the claims of Jesus are the works ascribed to him in the Gospel. If he came to do only the work of a prophet, or of a philanthropist, or of a teacher of ethical truth, the Incarnation would shrivel up into

an absurdity. The means would be out of all proportion to the end. If a world is to be redeemed from sin and guilt, could any one less than divine be equal to the task?

What follows this Lecture, is intended to set forth the stupendous results of the Incarnation.

In the appendix to Lecture VI he enlarges upon the "self-consciousness of Jesus." In recent years, interest has concentrated itself more and more on the question of Christ's self-consciousness, that is, on what he thought and felt about himself and how he arrived at these convictions.

In the last instance (Godet) Christianity rests on Christ's witness to himself.

HIGHER CONCEPT OF GOD INVOLVED IN THE INCARNATION.

The point reached at the conclusion of the sixth Lecture was that the facts of Christ's Revelation are irreconcilable with any lower estimate of his person than that which we find in the Apostolic writings.

This conclusion is confirmed by the historical fact that no lower estimate of his character and person has been found able to maintain itself.

The worship paid to Christ, and that from the earliest period, marks a distinction between his Divinity and that of every other. Not simply as a possessor of a communicated Divine nature, but in the root and essence of his own personality he *was Divine*. The higher concept of God involved in the Incarnation is the doctrine of the *Trinity*, God as triune, Father, Son and Spirit. This doctrine has not been gained by speculation, but by induction from the facts of God's self-revelation. Prof. Flint says of the Trinity: "A mystery indeed, yet one which explains many other mysteries, and which sheds a marvellous light on God, on nature and on man."

Martensen has declared: "If Christian Dogmatics had not asserted the doctrine of the Trinity, ethics must postulate it in its own defense." "God is one, but not solitary." "God is Love." Love implies an object of equal dignity, and of equal duration. The doctrine of the Son fills this want. For in

the beginning He was with God, and thought it not robbery to be equal *with God*. The apparent contradiction of "One and Three," and "Three in One," is not peculiar to the Trinity in the *God-head*. Take any object—it can only be conceived of as unity of Substance, yet plurality of attributes. Take Mind—it is one, if anything is, yet we distinguish in it a variety of powers.

This oneness and manifoldness, is just as true in Spencer's theory of An Unknowable Power, which manifests itself in matter and mind, as also in the monistic Systems of Haeckel and Hartman, as it is in the Christian system.

THE INCARNATION AND REDEMPTION FROM SIN.

Whatever is said of the Incarnation in its wider relations, it remains the fact that in Scripture it is always brought into immediate connection with sin and with the purpose of God in Redemption.

"He was manifested to take away sin, and in him was no sin;" so say all the writers in the New Testament. Christianity is thus distinctively a religion of Redemption.

All inadequate theories of Christianity are set aside—such as see in Christ only a great teacher, preacher, reformer, philanthropist, enthusiast for humanity. Christ is all this, but infinitely more. He redeems from sin and restores again the Divine likeness which has been lost by man.

All the writers of the New Testament regard the forgiveness of sins and the salvation of men as connected in a peculiar way with the death of Christ. They ascribe to Christ's death a sacrificial and expiatory value. They express the most intense conviction that they themselves were redeemed and reconciled to God by the death of Christ upon the Cross.

John the Baptist pointing to Him said: "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." Christ's own words are proof of his sacrificial death. To Nicodemus He said:

"As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up."

At the Institution of the Holy Supper He said: "This is my body, this is my blood of the New Covenant which is shed for many, unto remission of sins."

Later to the Eleven he said, "These are my words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you; now that all things must needs be fulfilled, which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the Psalms concerning me."

Then opened He their mind that they might understand the Scriptures; and He said unto them, "Thus it is written, that Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead on the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name unto all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." The author observes, that all theories of Redemption within Christian limits agree in taking for granted three things as included in Redemption from Sin:

1. There is the removal of guilt, which carries with it the sense of Divine forgiveness.
2. There is the breaking down of the enmity of man's heart and will to God, and the turning of the sinner from dead works to serve the living God.
3. The fellowship of the believer with Christ, and the consciousness of a Divine Sonship.

THE INCARNATION AND HUMAN DESTINY.

After discarding the doctrines of Universalism, annihilation, and modifying somewhat the Church-doctrine of eternal punishment—to consist in loss of capacity for enjoyment, and loss of the soul's high destiny, rather than in that of eternal suffering, he proceeds to lay down a few fundamental positions which seem to him of the nature of certainties.

1. First is the truth enunciated by the prophet, "Say ye of the righteous, that it shall be well with them, for they shall eat the fruit of their doings. Woe unto the wicked! it shall be ill with him; for the reward of his hands shall be given him," in other words, the great and fundamental principle of certain retribution for sin. Whatever tends to tamper with this prin-

ciple, or to weaken its hold upon the conscience, is alien to the true Christian view.

There is no clear and certain Scripture which affirms that all men will be saved ; on the other hand, there are many passages which look in another direction, which seem to put the stamp of finality on the sinner's state in eternity. Neither is the doctrine of a future probation clearly taught in Scripture—but the intense concentration of every ray of exhortation and appeal is against it.

"Now is the acceptable time ; behold *now* is the day of Salvation." It is not ours to lift the veil where God has left it drawn.

The question here and now is—"How shall we escape if we neglect so great Salvation?"

THE IDEA OF THE KINGDOM.

The intention of the author was to add another Lecture—on "The Incarnation and the new life of Humanity"—but it was abandoned, and the substance is given in the *Appendix*. After the Resurrection came the exaltation. After Calvary came Pentecost. After the Ministry of the Son came the dispensation of the Spirit. The new life proceeding from Christ, entering first as a regenerating principle into the individual soul, was gradually to permeate and transform society ; and society thus transformed becomes the Kingdom of God on Earth.

The Kingdom of God is not something which humanity produces by its own efforts, but something which comes to it from above.

It is the entrance into humanity of a new life from heaven. In its origin, its powers, its blessings, its aims, its end, it is supernatural and heavenly. Hence it is the Kingdom of God *on earth*, as it is to be in heaven.

The Kingdom of God, in its simplest definition is the reign of God in human hearts and in society.

The Church is the visible expression of this kingdom in the world ; the *only* society which does formally profess to represent it, though often very imperfectly.

It is not the direct business of the Church to promote art, science, politics, literature, etc., but to bear witness for God and His truth; yet the Church has a side toward all these other matters, especially for the social good and bettering of mankind.

In conclusion, I would say—that the work of Dr. Orr throughout is scholarly, the field of view comprehensive, the investigation thorough, the argument convincing, the quotations well chosen, and the conclusions of the author thoroughly orthodox.

ARTICLE V.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

BY REV. GEORGE C. HENRY, A.M.

We all acknowledge the Scripturalness of Church Discipline and are forced to admit its sometimes necessity. On these basal facts the whole of this decidedly delicate and difficult subject rests; for the Christian congregation, like every other community, needs discipline in order to suppress or get rid of anything that might impair or destroy its life.

The Christian congregation is a community of the faithful; and it is in this community, the Church, the congregation of saints, that "the Gospel is correctly taught and the sacraments properly administered. And for the true unity of the Church it is sufficient to agree concerning the doctrines of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments." This means, what? that the character of its discipline is purely spiritual (Schaff-Herzog). The object of all Church Discipline is, we take it, twofold: first, to prevent scandal; second, to retrieve the offender. What can the Church do? The only means she has is exclusion from the community; this exclusion to be partial or total as the premises in the sad affair may dictate. I will not consider a punishment by the Church which has a civil effect. This carrying of Church matters to civil courts and of having the affairs of a congregation pounced upon and pawed.

by unregenerate men and made a butt of joke and jest, is to me most repugnant. Let any Christian congregation take joyfully the spoiling of its goods than enjoy the pleasures (?) of sin (court) for a season.

Some years ago at West Point, Cadet Foy had a very, very funny bit of hazing. He had captured one of the "plebes" and had him in his tent undergoing some of the most exhausting motions known to the drill-master. Foy lay down the better to enjoy the scene and kept his poor prisoner at the "quickstep" and doing the "spread-eagle" for an hour or more. Lieutenant Dyer, on the lookout for hazing, discovered the sorry predicament to which Foy's sense of fun had reduced the young Freshman and an arrest followed. Cadet Foy was sentenced to confinement for one year, with a tour of guard-duty every Saturday and his privileges were suspended. That was the United States Government, and who at West Point could gainsay it?

Whenever Church Discipline comes up, the informed mind at once turns to the center of the whole subject, namely, Matthew 18 : 15-18 :

"If thy brother sin against thee, go show him his fault between thee and him alone: if he hear thee thou hast gained thy brother. But if he hear thee not, take with thee one or two more, that at the mouth of two witnesses or three, every word may be established. And if he refuse to hear them, tell it unto the Church; and if he refuse to hear the Church also let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican. Whatsoever things," etc., etc.

Some of us, likely, can recall cases where this has been literally followed with blessed results. The practical application is given in the Apostolic Church and recorded in I Cor. 5.; and in II Cor. 2 : 4-8. A member of the Corinthian Church had taken his stepmother for a wife and the congregation had made no objection. When we read of the immorality of that ancient seaport, notorious even in the heathen world, so that "to Corinthianize" was proverbial for licentiousness; when we read of the worship of Venus maintained with shame-

less profligacy and its 1,000 female slaves, we are amazed that it was nothing worse. Paul, you remember, wrote as soon as he heard of the scandal, that he who had done this should be excommunicated and delivered unto Satan (whatever that means). Now mark the happy effect on both the offender and the congregation that, when he wrote the second letter, he could recommend mercy. The apostle, however, does not confine himself to such like flagrant offenses but demands punishment for minor offenses, such as idleness by which a man is made a burden to his fellowmen (2 Thes. 3 : 6 ff). The word "disorderly" is given as deviating from the prescribed order or rule. In verse 2 he speaks of "busybodies" which means one who busies oneself about trifling, needless, useless matters, used apparently of a person officiously inquisitive about others' affairs (Thayer).

Paul, too, flies the danger signal most vigorously before heresy "which," he says, "eats as doth a gangrene," 2 Tim. 2 : 17. After a heretic has been admonished once or twice in vain he is to be avoided (Tit. 3 : 10). Even the loving John is guided by the Spirit to say that such a one is not to be received into your house and to be given no greeting (2 John 10-11.)

Now, supposing punishment necessary, there is a remarkable difference in the way of administration. It is possible so to do it that the Church could well say with one of old, "I will now turn aside and see this great sight." My sainted father (blessings on his memory!) once had occasion to punish with whipping his only son, the only whipping the son can recall; but before he was taken up to the "Black Curtain," the place of local imprisonment in that parsonage at P——, the father impressed this fact upon that youthful mind before he applied the switch to that youthful back, that he was doing this because he loved him! Queer sort of love, that! Such language was "all Greek" to the child, but the remembrance of it after many years makes the grateful tears to start.

Take a flagrant case, even, like the one the Corinthian congregation had on its hands. Why should discipline be admin-

istered at all? Recall the double object: to prevent scandal and retrieve the offender. As to the first: there are certain administrators who, in seeking to prevent scandal, would be as Samson's foxes among the standing corn. "The last and the highest aim is the reconciliation of the offender" (Schaff-Herzog). "Thou hast gained thy brother." It surely is not hard to perceive that there is only one spirit that ought to be allowed breathing place in a church discipline case and that is the spirit of LOVE. Listen to this:

"Out of much affliction and anguish of heart I wrote unto you with many tears; not that you should be made sorry but that you might know the love which I have more abundantly unto you. But if any have caused sorrow, not to me, but in part (that I press not too heavily, to you all)," etc., etc. (2 Cor. 2 : 5 ff).

The whole passage is tenderly beautiful. When the spirit of love dictates both the necessity and the administration of punishment, whatever else the circumstances in the case, I believe that offenders so dealt with would feel highly grateful that it was nothing worse, as the old darkey whose case was pleaded by a young lawyer, the son of his former master. It was Marse Frank's first plea and brilliant in neither construction nor delivery. But there was another element there which the old Ethiopian perceived. It was a case of chicken-stealing and the evidence was so direct and overwhelming that the judge gave him a rather severe sentence. "Thank ye, jedge," said the old sable culprit, "thank ye, I thought that 'tween my cha'acter and pore Marse Frank's speech, dey'd hang me shore."

The Apostolic Church in time became a thing of the past, but cases calling for discipline did not. In the post-apostolic Church existed the institutions of *excommunication* and *reconciliation*. We are now in the times of persecution. They were awful enough under Nero and Trajan and Marcus Aurelius and Septimius Severus; but when Decius (A. D. 249-251) came to the throne he resolved to wholly exterminate Christianity. Now the Church of the Christ is tried by confiscation, banish-

ment, exquisite tortures and death, anything to make confessors apostatize. Some did not and died; some did and lived. They were called the lapsed, who, in time were sorry that they had recanted and wanted to be taken back again. A special regulation for their reconciliation became a necessity and continued valid for two centuries. Eusebius is rather quiet about the whole affair but says enough to show that the number of apostates was fearful (Schaff-Herzog), with the defection more or less concealed. These crowds of fallen ones were divided into: 1, *sacrificati*, those who had sacrificed in order to preserve their lives; 2, *thurificati*, who had burned incense before the images of the gods; 3, *libellatici*, who without having actually sacrificed, had bribed the magistrates to give them a certificate of having done so; and later on in the time of Galerius, *traditores* who had given up heretical writings pretending that they were sacred books. It must have required quite a judicial mind and one able to logically differentiate related things, to have settled these cases. Cyprian would have made a short cut through them all, for his principle, stoutly maintained, was that all mortal sins are sins committed "against God" and dared not be included in the range of penitential discipline. But the voice of the Church broke forth in passionate entreaty for these lapsed crowds and induced by it he yields and goes so far as to declare that reconciliation should be granted to the *Libellatici* after a full penitential course, but to the *sacrificati* only when in danger of death! (Kurtz). By and by, here and there, discipline became somewhat lax. As is always the case, a reaction towards greater severity followed.

The Montanists, in their fanatical enthusiasm, declared that Church discipline ought to be excessively rigorous and that the excommunicated ought to remain in a state of penance for the rest of their unnatural lives. The Novatians drew still tighter party lines and with patronizing blasphemy pronounced that, though by the mercy of God the lapsed might be pardoned, the Church had no right to assure them forgiveness. So it came to pass that discipline had only a name that it lived; and when the Christian Church became the State Church it died

and the corpse changed color. The casuists—men who study and settle cases of conscience—undertook a settlement of the question by tabulating a list of penance fines. A little before this Dead Sea level was reached there was a partial resuscitation in decaying Israel when the Donatists arose, declaring that the Church should be kept absolutely pure and that a sacramental action (*e. g.*, baptism, ordination etc.), was invalid if performed by a person who was, or deserved to be, excommunicated. It was too late, however; Church discipline, spiritually speaking, was dead. Externally the Church had now become an earthly kingdom and under the great Gregory purgatory was firmly annexed; and the celebrated Peter Lombard (ob. 1164) thereupon long afterwards began the erection of the theory of indulgence which undertakes to transmit sins upon a cash basis. Peter did not have his title, "*Magister Sententiarum*" for nothing; for, according to him the Church has the power not only to transform the punishments of Purgatory into earthly punishments but also to transform the latter into simple money-fines! Lombard was like the boy whom Mark Twain once saw along the highway hitting some object with a stone and causing a rebound at each smiting. Coming up he saw that it was a woodchuck. "Why, it's dead," said Mr. Clemens. "Dead! of course it's dead; but I'm trying to mellow it." The schoolmen kept mellowing it and two hundred years after Lombard in 1343, Clement VI (ob. 1352) solemnly and officially declared that they were right. Think of it! Picture the confusion and warping of the tender, loving idea of discipline as Jesus first enunciated it with *penance, i. e.*, satisfaction. Look at the discipline of an apostate Church consisting of punishments in the shape of alms, pilgrimages, fasts, participation in a crusade, etc., etc. And then—as if all this were not secular or silly enough—to solemnly declare that if these were found to be too inconvenient a cash value therefor could be substituted!

"O judgment, thou art fled to brutish beasts
And men have lost their reason."

In the Middle Ages the greatest punishments which the

Church could inflict were *excommunication* and the *interdict*: excommunication directed against individuals, and the interdict against whole districts. Had the Church been wholly spiritual and these consisted wholly in exclusion from communion with the congregation they would both have shown the true character of the discipline under consideration. So far, however, as spirituality was concerned, their name was Ichabod. One can easily imagine the air with which the Anathema was sent hurtling against hardened sinners, that awesome denunciation and curse involving exclusion from all Church privileges, extending even to refusal of Christian burial. It cannot be denied that the Interdict was a fearful gun to train on a community and rarely did it miss its aim or fail to accomplish its purpose. Think of all church bells silent, the liturgical part of the worship held with closed doors, only the dying receiving penance and the eucharist, only priests, mendicant friars, strangers, and children under two years of age receiving Christian burial, and nobody dare be married! A whole district responsible for sin committed or tolerated in it! A modern Achan. Had the offence always been a spiritual one against a spiritual Church the case might have been good; but the offence might just as easily have been a quarrel with the Pope in whose hands it became indeed a terrible weapon and not infrequently most effectually exercised when they and the princes had fall outs during the 12th and 13th centuries. Peter Lombard must have been happy during this state, for he described Church discipline as "*contritio cordis, confessio oris, satisfactio operis.*" Alas! all moral earnestness oozed out of it. As crowds of worldly-minded men who supposed that gain was godliness were drawn into the Church, which became more and more conformed to the world, outward works more and more took the place of heart-sorrow. True, voices, as in the night, were here and there heard, especially from the monasteries, pleading for serious measures, but they died away into horrible silence, broken only by the sound of self-inflicted lashings, 3000 being the number requisite for one year of penance—the lashes being laid on while the victim was reciting the Psalter. We have but one more step

to take when lo! the Inquisition stands before us. The apostolical institution of Church discipline has degenerated into this, the very mention of which sends a shudder to the heart—the Inquisition, which in Spain alone immolated on its flaming shambles more than 300,000 victims!

Then came the Reformation and the cry was "Back to the principles of the Apostolic Church." In 1519 Luther in his sermon "vom Bann" declares that the civil authorities have no share in the matter of the punishment of the offender, and here he insists upon the just motive—the reconciliation of the offender (Schaff-Herzog in loc.) At first he always placed the congregation in the foreground and the office in the background; but after the contest with the enthusiasts and the dangerous crisis into which they threw the Reformation in Germany he began to change his views and to emphasize the offices. He evidently changed them very decidedly; for in 1529 in his preface to the smaller Catechism he says in his unmistakable Saxon: "If any refuse to receive your instructions, tell them plainly that they deny Christ and are not Christians; such persons shall not be admitted to the Lord's Table, nor present a child for baptism, nor enjoy any of our Christian privileges, but are sent back to the pope and to his agents and to Satan himself." So far punishments may be classed under an ecclesiastical head but this next seems to me a bit popish, or even worse: "their parents and employers should, besides, refuse to furnish them with food and drink, and notify them that the government was disposed to banish from the country all persons of such rude and intractable character!" Subsequently, we are happy to state, this harsh view is modified.

In the Symbolical Books discipline is rightly treated as a part of soul-cure but in our European Lutheran Churches this phase of Church life was but feebly developed and not always in the right direction. In a state church, discipline is apt to degenerate into a matter of civil legislation. Look at princes ordering their subjects under heavy penalties to go to Church three times every Sunday; if not, the poor were scourged or put into stocks and the rich were fined. A legal mind were indeed ne-

cessary to discover the difference between church discipline and police regulations. Of course, the Rationalists made a clean sweep of such laws, but along with them went every trace of genuine discipline as well.

In Zurich, Zwingli handed the whole matter of church discipline over to the magistrate and considered it right to prosecute a member for whose improvement simple excommunication was not enough.

In Geneva, Calvin had a special board of discipline but this board added heavy civil penalties, even death, to the interdict.

Turning now to our own country, in the Episcopal Church, the canons (ominous word!) have this subject in keeping. Quite significant is it that these canons are trained mainly on the clergy; but laymen can be kept from the Lord's Supper on conviction of serious offences. In the Presbyterian Church, discipline is lodged in the hands of the session. The subjects are all "baptized persons." The offence must be public, and grave enough to demand the attention of the session; but private exhortation is first employed. So with the Reformed Churches. In the Congregational Church it is purely a congregational matter and there is no appeal. In the Methodist Church there is appeal. The accused member is brought before a committee of not less than five, not members of the quarterly conference. The parties may challenge for cause the selection of the committee. If the pastor in charge dissent from the finding of the committee he can appeal to the ensuing quarterly conference. Expulsion is the penalty for unworthy conduct on the part of the accused members. A Methodist pastor, on speaking to me some time ago concerning an unworthy member, confessed his inability to do anything on the matter because his stewards would not back him. This unworthy one, like Esau, was a profane person but possessed of some means and local influence and boasted that they wouldn't do anything to him!

In a case of discipline, not in a Methodist Church, but in a Lutheran, there was a church court being held, and I know not that the parties challenged for cause the selection of the committee; but it is recorded that they challenged each other in

the most pugilistic attitude, running their fists under each others' noses while still inside the building and challenging each other to a combat of fists outside, and all this exercise of the church militant right before the preacher in charge, who was bound to dissent from the finding of the parties.

Now, how much great matter which has been kindled by a little fire might be saved, if the manner of putting it out were different. I oft recall a case in my first charge where the penalty of suspension from church privileges for several months in a certain criminal case, was imposed by an aged elder and his young, inexperienced pastor, with tears both in their eyes and in their voices, the parents of the unfortunate young woman, acquiescing. The sequel proved the happiness of this way. I know, too, a pastor who to this day never recalls a certain wretched case of accused marital infidelity without a sinking at the heart. Details cannot be given as the parties are all living. Briefly stated it is this: a Mr. and Mrs. X., angry for some cause at a Mrs. Y., formerly a friend, *united* in accusing Mrs. Y. and Mr. X. of criminal intimacy. The pastor and an elder went to see Mrs. Y. and adjured her solemnly as if she knew that she were going to die the next minute, to tell the truth. She as solemnly attested her innocence. Mr. X. asseverated his guilt and with the coolest nonchalance informed the pastor that it was simply a matter of veracity between his word and hers! If the reader could but know the Mephistophelian character of Mrs. X. it would greatly aid in the recital. Suffice it to say that the Council suspended Mr. X. (the pastor actually shivering as he put the vote) and the next morning after Mr. X. had received the secretary's letter announcing the fact, receiving for their pains the cursed epithet from his lips in the presence of the pastor, of "fools." Mr. and Mrs. X. ceased coming to Church, while Mrs. Y. has ever since proved herself faithful and above reproach. The pastor, had he it to do over again, would first have striven with the parties to withdraw charges on the grounds of Mrs. Y.'s protestations of innocence; or, failing in that, would have advised the temporary suspension of all parties concerned, believing now that the final result would

have been as now. That pastor added another page of life's lessons to his book and he has been assiduously conning over it ever since.

The secret of Church discipline, I think, lies in seven words of the forth verse of the fifth chapter of first Corinthians, namely, "*In the Name of our Lord Jesus—ye being gathered together.*" That is a meeting of the Church. Christian men are being gathered together in many different ways day by day; that is not the meeting of the Church. Just as soon as they meet "in His Name" then a distinctive Church assembly is constituted, if only the well-known two or three. As to power, of which we speak so often and long for oftener, here too is it found: "With the power of our Lord Jesus." He must be present in the gathering and the only "power" there must be His. The scholars have cut out the account in St. John of the woman taken in adultery, not with Jehoiakim's penknife, but on the best of authority, but "till He come" the Church should have that picture and that spirit at every gathering for the disciplining of unworthy ones.

How tenderly S. Paul refers to the matter in his second letter to the Corinthians (I : 23 f.), "I call God for a witness upon my soul that to spare you I forbore to come unto Corinth. * * I determined this for myself, that I would not come again to you with sorrow," etc., etc. A Congregational minister, an intimate friend in the West, told me of a case in his first charge in Danbury, Connecticut, where a weak brother would every now and then get on a spree; but he begged them not to throw him out. "Hold on to me! Don't let me go! If you do, I'm gone." To such a one truly the name and power of the Lord Jesus must have meant much.

The whole subject is one requiring sanctified common sense and tact. It is recognized as wise pastoral policy and family policy and government policy to punish as seldom as possible, aiming at recovery and restoration rather than infliction and excommunication. How to root out the tares we pastors find a very annoying pastoral question, the vexéd question of pas-

toral ethics. May we be guided by the Holy Spirit in matters requiring such delicate handling.

We pastors, at times during our ministry (I speak as a man), may have felt like the little boy whose smaller sister had a very pronounced and persistent propensity to upset her mother's spool-basket. The mother had impressed the naughtiness of this act in such clear tones and so many times that the small boy had a profound regard for the gravity of the offence. One day the mother heard an uproar, and going to the seat of war found the spool-basket upset and the smaller sister bathed in tears. The cause was explained by the elder brother who complacently remarked: "She upset your basket, mamma, but she's all pankt."

ARTICLE VI.

MINISTERIAL EDUCATION.

BY REV. C. P. WILES.

The literature upon this subject, voluminous as it has been, for the past century, may be roughly divided into three periods of equal length. The closing years of the one when compared with the opening years of the other, may present no clear line of demarkation. They melt into one another without jar or friction. But when the writings distinctly characteristic of each period are brought together, they stand in marked contrast to those next it. There is no mistaking the fact that these years, swift as their flight has been, have been compelled to register a reversal of position as to the importance of Ministerial Education that is nothing short of phenomenal. So rapid have been the strides made, in this same period, in science, art, philosophy; in the harnessing of the hitherto unknown powers inherent in nature, that these have been reckoned as constituting the eighth wonder of the world. Along side of these startling achievements in the secular, there has been a corresponding advance in the religious world: The testing, correcting, eliminating and

reconstructing process by which new standards of clerical qualifications were made, through which ambassadors for Christ were put in possession of sources of power that had long been unutilized. The pace set by men in other professions, in discovery, invention, and in the dissemination of general intelligence, taught the men of God that there are untouched fountains of learning that should be directed into the channels of the Church; for if their accents are caught aright, they, too, speak of Him "who spread the flowing seas abroad, and built the lofty skies."

The first period, to which reference has been made, may be correctly styled: that of much opposition to anything like a liberal education. To this there were notable exceptions; professors in the newly founded Halls of learning, who, not from any selfish motive, as bare institutional prosperity, but out of deep love for the "field whitening unto the harvest," plead wherever opportunity afforded, for a more thorough equipment of those who were commissioned to preach the Word. Not a few occupants of pulpits, interpreting the future by the past, were profoundly convinced that the stability of that religious sect that despised learning, was fraught with peril. Holy men in other positions of eminence, as if with prophetic vision, cast their eyes upon the next generation and declared that if it did not seem the better part of wisdom for the present, yet for the inestimable benefits of those coming after, an educated ministry was demanded, holding that that which does not build wisely for the future is a questionable course of action for the present.

Notwithstanding these staunch advocates of what they considered so essential, there was a counter current so swift and strong that it required long years, and the urgency of altered conditions to turn it. There were whole ecclesiastical bodies in whom the defenders of a classical education could almost be counted on one's fingers. They stubbornly advocated the lifting of men from the plow and bench and counter to the pulpit, contending that whom God called he would anoint and equip for service.

Of course we must remember that the natural conditions of

those times were by no means favorable to an extended education. Those were days when religious bodies were practically in their infancy in our land. They were moments big with opportunity; the battle was on; denominational rivalry ran high. Steps were often taken for immediate supremacy, without regard to future permanence. A mighty tide of immigration was touching our shores; every hour was heavy with responsibility; those who left the homeland with the faith of their fathers must be held, those who arrived as strangers to the covenant of promise must be won. How can this be done? Send men, no time for delay. Civilization was extending her boundary line, the rod of empire was moving westward, heralds of the Cross must hasten to follow. The demands of the times were loud and clear. The language question was a serious barrier to education. Its problems have not yet been settled. Young men, not a few, who coveted the advantages of a collegiate and seminary training, were debarred because of pecuniary reasons, not being able to pay their own way, nor could they expect much from a Church that was in its day of small things. Hence, financial stringency apparently drove many into the sacred office without any intellectual culture and with a very crude conception of Systematic Theology. That Book which they were to hold up and interpret to others was sealed to themselves.

When these obstacles are arrayed they appear formidable and offer a partial apology for that current of opposition to an educated ministry. But it is *only* a partial apology. For there were individuals and there were churches who refused to be conquered by these apparently insuperable obstacles. They were assuredly confident that theirs were no merely human proposals or man-made standards, but that these were in clearest harmony with the call of the great Head of the Church. "If He summons, then these are heights that can be reached. He never leads to impossibilities." With such conceptions of duty they grappled with existing problems as men who face death. The language question, the money question, the immigration question, the question of early supremacy, all lift their

heads to oppose; But God calls, duty decrees it, self-preservation demands it. Men with great hearts and conquering faith armed themselves. They lifted themselves to positions others had yielded in despair. They plucked up the banner and planted it on ramparts before which others had weakened and fled. We need but read the history of our Lutheran Church during the first period of the last century, to find at least one religious body that built with care and diligence the fabric of her institutional life. This bit of history, more fascinating than a novel, when read in the light of present conditions, quite covers our faces with shame.

The second period of the last century may be named the period of complete dissatisfaction with former methods of dealing with applicants for the holy ministry. Unrest and upheaval characterized these years. Results from the former course of procedure had been meagre and unsatisfactory. There is truth in the familiar saying: more haste less speed. Movements that have offered immediate returns are such as have shorn the Church of her strength and usefulness. "There is a way that seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death" is as applicable to denominations as to the wicked. That we have given ourselves a religious name does not release us from perils to which others are subjected nor put in our hands the guarantee of an existence. Facts attest it. The door leading to the sacred office had been thrown open. Few safeguards were presented. The call of the Church for young men to preach the Word was loud. Some responded whom the meanest standard of intellectual equipment would have debarred. Others, under the undue emotional of the times, were persuaded they were "called," whose future conduct proved them both unfit and unworthy. A demand for reversal of methods in this second period elicits no surprise. Earlier systems had been found wanting. Churchmen were opening their eyes to the fact that whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap. The harvest had been pitiably disappointing. A ministry unqualified for its incomparable work had been sown and church invalidism had to be reaped. Sow ministerial un-

intelligence and reap ecclesiastical infirmity. Lamentably true, that they who sow incoherence of doctrine and a loose grasp of the fundamentals of faith will produce a constituency that will be rent by schism, and tossed on the bosom of every wave of doctrine. No religious superstructure of permanence can be lifted on shallow and unsubstantial foundations. They build wisely who build downward as well as upward. There must be thoroughness as well as scope. There is need of a preparation for, as well as a prosecution of, the Master's work. The former must give force, directness and efficiency to the latter. Without the former the latter faints by the way and is confronted by an incompetency that looms up at every turn. The fallacy of the argument of multitudes in the Church's beginnings a century ago is apparent in this; they said: Let us first become strong in membership, then we shall be able to establish schools of the prophets if necessary. The opposite ground was taken by the minority. They said: Let us *first* build our schools. Such a step may seem to cripple for the moment and to turn attention elsewhere than immediately demanded and to impose burdens unbearable. But they said: "This is basal work; it forbids postponement; to neglect it is criminal." As a consequence these schools began to send into the infant Church in many quarters a perennial stream of blessing no man can measure. An increment of life, a basis for enthusiasm, a good measure of mental capability, in the young man turned out, were given to a few religious bodies at least, which, under the blessing of God, were destined to hold together the disorganized elements and do much toward stemming the tide of atheistic and infidel literature that was sweeping our country with its withering touch.

It is not too much to declare that largely through our schools of religious training under certain sects, were the generations of the last century increasingly held for Christ. It was during the second period that these phenomena were being studied. History can not be untrue. She cheefully turns her pages that men may profit by the mistakes of the past. There had been mistakes. They were being recognized. The facts were in-

controvertible. The tide was speedily turning. Men who bitterly opposed what they called a loss of time, a waste of money and a decrease of power, in education, were coming to see that proper educational furnishings are a saving of time, economy in money and an increase of power. Steps must be retraced. Old methods must give way to new and better ones which time has tested and laid her hand of approval on. God places no premium on ignorance when knowledge is at hand. If in those moments of reconstruction the star of hope should pierce the darkened future for certain creeds, it would come to pass when pulpit dogmatism and declaration would be displaced by minds trained and disciplined in the works of God and taught how to divide the Word of truth. With such facts keenly apparent we are brought,

To the third period of the century which may be called: The period of uniform demand for an educated ministry. The pendulum when started swinging was certain to complete the arc. Defamers of that system that ordinarily required an intellectual equipment for the holiest of callings, turned completely around and now are its warmest friends. Bodies that welcomed indiscriminately applicants from all quarters without a question as to mental fitness, are rearing wise safeguards. A writer in our own fold makes use of this striking sentence: "The contrast between the almost rude, at least exceedingly limited facilities and attainments in education fifty years ago with the present, indicates an advance that, suggested then, would have been set down as the fancy of a dreamer or at most the possibility of centuries." The Church owes it to herself and to her young men to require that they shall pursue a prescribed course of study, who desire to minister at her altars. That substantial agreement has been reached on this point is a cause for much rejoicing, for it must result in perpetual blessing to all Christendom. Would that it had come sooner, for God long had been pointing the way; then would have been spared that ill-flavor under which the whole pulpit rests more or less to-day; then would have been saved us the unwilling picture of men falling unheard and unknown, who, with their native

talent cultivated and fed, would have taken a large hand in the affairs of God's kingdom, and shone as stars of superior splendor; then had not been taught essentials for non-essentials and vice-versa, as a consequence of which, men, in the attempt to readjust their faith, have, instead of coming to the fuller light, slipped into the denser darkness of scepticism; for is not a wide-open door to scepticism right here?—error in conception of correct Christian doctrine. Unintentional deception in spiritual verities leads quickly into avowed enemies of the Gospel of our Saviour. It is a well founded conviction that some whose tongue and pen were ever busy attacking the whole system of Christian theology and casting doubt on beliefs dear to every heart, would have been used even more persuasively in defense of the Cross, but for an abnormal application of saving truth. These are but few of the hurtful influences emanating from system reckoned with things past. That to day there is unanimity of opinion as to the value of Ministerial Education is cause for profound gratitude; it will enhance the dignity of the office and lay better tracks along which God's chariot will roll with quicker pace.

While the pen of the historian was busy recording the sweeping change of sentiment on so vital a point as an educated clergy, it will be interesting to note the attitude of the Lutheran Church on this question. It is a matter of common intelligence that the Lutheran people have always stood for education. That there have been a few discordant voices can not be denied; they have only served to fix our attention on the overwhelming consensus of opinion. The mother of Protestantism was born in a University and her four hundred years of steady progress attest her high regard for the place of her birth. Perhaps no other denomination at home or abroad has been drawing such an uninterrupted supply of consecrated and enlightened talent from centres of learning as she has. This spirit was wafted to our shores. The seed was planted in the rich soil of the Western Hemisphere and has grown to become a leading characteristic of the Lutheran Church of America.

The story of the beginnings of Lutheran College and Semi-

nary life is thrilling. It discloses a zeal, a consecration of wealth, a penetration of wisdom and apostolic sacrifices before which we stand transfixed. When we bear in mind that at the arrival of the Patriarch Muhlenberg about the middle of the 18th Century, the Lutheran Church in America can scarcely be said to have existed, and that at the opening of the 19th Century a few thousands would embrace the entire roll of membership, we would almost regard in such conditions the assuming of the burden of schools as reckless and inadvisable. But there were certain facts staring them in the face: (1) That not a few talented young men, not supplied in their own Church, were seeking educational advantages at Columbia and Dickinson Colleges, at Princeton and University of Pennsylvania, some to return with lax doctrinal views and others lost entirely to our beloved Zion. (2) That an untrained pulpit was powerless before the cultured and blatant agnosticism which was shaking Christianity to its center; and (3) That an educated ministry—on the human side—was the only assurance of the perpetuity of the Church. Deep down in the heart of clergy and laity there burned an ambition that was irresistible, and, girding themselves, they swept to the very border-lines of the impossible, and, what was but recently a dream, had blossomed in hope and hope quickly crystallized in realization, and great rejoicing rolled across the bosom of the Church. For scarcely had the sun arisen on the greatest of all centuries until Hartwick Seminary was opened, with an enrollment the first year of 44. Closely upon its heel followed Gettysburg; almost a dozen in a little more than a quarter of a century. And an engaging question with the westward van of civilization is: How about schools? To read of Schmucker going out on collecting tours and returning with as high as \$15,000 is no mean comment on the recognized importance of this work. To-day our own denomination has 25 Academies, 45 Colleges, and 27 Theological Seminaries. These figures, grand as they are, express but slightly the immeasurable benefit heaven alone can reveal. Is it too much to say that if these institutions have done nothing more than offer to the Church an equipped ministry, in *that* they "have spread abroad the spirit of the Reformation, fired with new zeal min-

isters and laymen, elevated the standard of piety, diffused a spirit of benevolence and given to all who heard, the pure Word of God." Who will deny that our position of prestige, power and privilege in the world to-day, the rising tide of our unmatched opportunities, are directly traceable to the fountains of learning which have been the throbbing heart of the Church? These are not fancies or visions, but the underscored facts of History. For many they have been read in tears and learned over the sacrifice of immortal souls. Does history repeat itself? Our Church has had a great past, she is having a greater present, she is facing a still greater future. Men, by no means partial to our faith, have conceded the richness of our field. Opportunities so frequent would fail to make an impression but for the solemn duty they impose. Calls come from the Foreign field, from liberal New England, from untouched Western fields, from our own Synod, calls to enter and possess. God has given the harvest and we seem powerless. What shall we do? Let history answer. It has words of eloquence we would do well to hear. A message so unequivocal that to misread it would place in jeopardy our highest interests. There is a haste that is morally reprehensible. When proficiency is being demanded more and more in every other profession, it ill-becomes us in any way to lower our standard of the Ministerial office.

But now, what do we mean by an educated ministry? We may venture a few suggestions on the phases of this subject:

(1) Its Breadth and (2) Its Limitation.

I. ITS BREADTH

The manner of preaching has undergone a radical change in the last two and a half decades. It is to be supposed both methods sought the same end. There has ever existed a unity of purpose; viz., a moving of the will so as to lead it into a deliberate choosing of Christ as Saviour. This may be accomplished in two ways: first, by stirring the emotions, secondly, by informing the intellect. The first, or the play upon the feelings, was formerly a predominant method. It is not meant that there can be an arousing of the emotions without some in-

tellectual food, nor that there can be a wholesome informing of the mind, without a consequent emotion of joy. The emotional nature has a place in religion. It is God's gift, and it will droop and perish, nor ever reach its highest and best until it finds again its native air and moves in realms spiritual. But in the preceding generation and somewhat in our own, undue emphasis was laid on the quickening of the feelings to the unwarranted elimination of man's power of thought. In this the very cornerstone was forgotten and there was reared many a tottering superstructure.

A very prominent divine whose life just closed, said this of his style of preaching: When a politician tries to make votes, he tries to fuse the whole body into one mass and make them vote for Grant or Lincoln. I try to fuse my congregation into one mass and make them hurrah a vote for Jesus Christ. A very conservative critic says of this confession: It reveals the secret of his weakness. It is too easy to hurrah for Jesus Christ and stop there. Having attracted a larger congregation than that preached to by any other clergyman of his denomination, he failed to build up a working church. His church carried on no organized endeavor and gave nothing for benevolence. When he resigned, his church went to pieces. A fair comment, this, on that kind of preaching, styled wholly emotional. It leaves a people unrooted and ungrounded in the truth. It gathers a constituency, vacillating and unmuscle, that will hardly stand the burning sun of persecution or the chilly winds of doubt, and leaves in the wake of its progress few abiding results. It has filled up ranks that have been easy prey to the pernicious literature and corrupted beliefs that grow rank in our land. It has lowered the dignity of the ministry, curtailed the lines of her power and invited disrespect from the general public. We are wholly justified in the conviction that the sacred office will be respected when its equipments and qualifications are respectable and when its work is pursued along authorized, worthy and Scriptural lines. Is there anything that has done more to array science against religion, to cause scientists and philosophers to look askance at our holy

faith; to spread the rumor among the children of this world that if Scripture is right, science is wrong, and if science is true the Scriptures are false; if the Bible is to be accounted correct, then the dicta of philosophy are absurd; I say, what has done more to deny there is a harmony of science and religion than shallow emotionalism? The unenlightened, untrained ministry have unanimously adopted this style. This method of moving men to an acceptance of Christ, when almost wholly resorted to, is "justly chargeable with numerous transgressions."

We have shifted our position. We are not feeding the emotional less, but the intellectual nature of man more. We believe the instruction of the understanding to be the first point to be taken, which, when intelligently and forcibly done will kindle the deepest feeling, *both* resulting in the capture of the citadel of the will, thus making man in his entirety and fullest manhood the child of God. We may state our syllogism thus: The basis of a strong faith on the part of God's people is a mind stored with divine truth. This knowledge is largely obtained by means of pulpit ministrations. Hence the necessity of an educated ministry. Brethren, there never was a time when facts meant so much as now. We can not, we dare not, appeal to the emotional side as we once did. "Our tenderest appeals must be wrested from mere sentiment and based upon established truth." Truth does not deny faith, nor supercede it, but it fortifies it. It is the sheet-anchor above whose steadying hold faith casts her eye triumphantly into the heavens and grips the deep mysteries of God. It is facts people in the pew want, and we must be able to furnish them. The methods of the past are inadequate for the present. There is not less of faith to-day than before, but more of thought. Some think that for faith to have its perfect work, man must abide in ignorance. If, under the discoveries of science, and the researches of the Orient, we are permitted to see what once was a matter of faith, what does this mean but that we are gradually approaching the day when trembling faith shall break into perfect sight. This, then, is our contention here, the min-

ister must not only stir emotions, but be able to feed the intellect.

Then, too, we address intellectual audiences. We speak to men and women who have been trained in the power of logical thought. They have pursued courses of study. They think while we preach. They weigh our utterances in the balance of reason. They ever shift the foot for established truth. It must be given fairly, impartially. Spurgeon, at the zenith of his fame said: The minister should always take for granted his audience knows nothing. By which he meant that the messenger should make his message simple and intelligible. An unintentional, but forcible indictment of an untrained clergy. For who so capable of constructing a message suitable alike to illiterate and scholarly, as he whose knowledge is orderly, thorough and comprehensive. Who so clear in speech and parable as Jesus? The common people heard him gladly, and yet who so deep that the keenest minds have sat at His feet to catch his deeper meaning? The ability to present God's Word to the comprehension of the unlettered does not imply superficial thinking. It has been said: Adapt the message to the unread and it will suit the well-read. It is to be feared that has too frequently led the Gospel minister into the unpardonable error of supposing any disjointed and partial presentation of the word of life is sufficient. We must preach to the ignorant, but we need not thereby give offense to the learned. Apples of gold are beautiful, but more so in pictures of silver. Let us turn that saying around and learn its truth for to-day: Adapt the message to the learned and it will suit the unlearned. By this is not meant the frequent use of technical phrases, nor the interjection of strange languages, but that the mind, so trained as to think logically, feel deeply and choose intelligently, is alone competent to present a message clearly and effectively to the intelligent and the only one *fit* to present it to the unintelligent. Religious teachers to-day must know whom they have believed. The day is spent when the plowman who whistled in his furrow yesterday wears the cloth to-morrow. If we are to arrest men, gain a hearing, instruct their minds and win their hearts, it will be *when* we are God-taught and man-

taught instructors who can give a reason for the hope that is in us and so give it that under the power of the Holy Spirit that same hope may send its light into darkened souls.

But you ask, Have not uneducated men preached with power and acceptance? Are there not exceptions? Yes, there are; not nearly so many, however, as the world has estimated. And a pertinent question here is: May it not be possible that they too might have preached even more powerfully and acceptably if they had availed themselves of the advantages of our institutions which under the Providence of God have become so vital to our Church life? Granted there have been exceptions like a Moody who, outstripping men of superior mental culture, caused a gazing world to inquire: Whence hath this man such wisdom seeing he has never learned letters? And yet we have never had a warmer friend of schools than Moody, who left no less than three as monuments to his memory and became the inspiration of as many more. His own meagre mental attainments were most keenly felt by himself and forced him to lend his heartiest approval to an educated ministry. We have nothing to do with exceptions except to try to discourage them. If God raises up exceptions he will take care of them. We must discover His *laws* and operate through and move in harmony with them. The husbandman, though anxious about his crops, does not take account of stray stars that dart across the heavens in seeming lawlessness, but he does set his store by the orderly revolutions of the sun, moon and stars that forever move in known tracks of light. The mariner does not reckon on uncertain waves, but he does guide his ship with trade winds and gulf stream. It were a sin of deepest dye to stand and wait for exceptions in the ministry—very rare and uncertain things. We have discovered long ago God's regular trade winds and gulf streams of blessing; He has pointed to them with fingers of flame; we must move according to system and methodical arrangement. And if our institutions are God's answers to fervent prayer we may believe they should be a uniform means of preparing young men for the ministry.

We believe then, in breadth of scholarship, this general

standard may be made (without reference to any particular studies) a regular course in both our institutions, an ability to address the intellect, as well as stir the emotions, a systematic and coherent knowledge of the fundamental doctrines of God's word that those who hear may be enlightened and edified in the things that make for peace.

What is the limitation of Ministerial Education? We locate it in this: The man thus equipped must say: This one thing I do. The range of his thinking has been broad, the fields covered have been many, but over it all he ought to be able to say with his Lord: To this end was I born and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Just one thing—to bear witness unto the truth. There are many things we should love to do, lines of study we should be delighted to pursue, but our equipment has not been for the unworthy ends of personal pleasure or worldly applause; above them all stands the name of Jesus that yet needs to be preached to two-thirds of our race. The man prepared for this work has covered a variety of subjects, all with the dominant intention that he may preach with greater effectiveness the unsearchable riches of Christ. Ministerial Education is broad in its scope, but very narrow in its aim. It has a breadth, but it has a limitation. Through the marvelous diversity of study, there runs a unity of purpose.

The honey bee leaves the hive with humming song, it rises on palpitating wing, and sails over hill and valley, woodland and stream till it settles on some waving clover head, from which it extracts the juicy nectar, and returns to its hive. No matter how far or in what direction it has roamed, or where it may fold its wings, it is on one mission; a multiplicity of sources, but one object. There is no man to whom God has opened such boundless fields of thought and research as to the bearers of the light. Other professional men have to do with earthly things, we have to do with the earthly and heavenly. But as we roam across these plains, noting the rise and fall of empires, the movement of God in history, the achievements of science, what truth sweeter than honey is there here that will help make clear His message to men and add to our efficiency

in declaring it? Ministerial Education broadens our horizon, leads us to and fro in the wide domain of God's laws in nature and grace, but its highest genius is that from all these sources there may be gathered an accumulation of power that we may touch our one task with a magic hand. Breadth of view, depth of thought, but concentration of power. The writer chanced at an agricultural institute some years ago where a lecturer of note was addressing the Convention on the "Potato." At the conclusion of his address he gave the audience an opportunity to ask questions, whereupon a farmer asked this question: Can a man afford to raise potatoes for 25 cents per bushel. The lecturer answered in five words: You can't, but I can. He meant that while the farmer knew what he wanted to grow and that alone, *he* knew both *what* he wanted to grow and *how* to grow it. He knew the potato in its constituent parts, he knew what it needed for its highest development; he studied the soil and found what it lacked and fed it with proper fertilizers, he studied the best methods of cultivation so that whether wet or dry his crop would not be affected. He was a scholarly man, but his knowledge bore entirely on his work. And of the score or more of things he had studied with diligence, every one of them added its wealth to the crop his heart had been set upon growing. In like manner is to be stated at once the unequalled breadth and exceeding narrowness of the minister's equipment. A solitary task: preach the Word. But there is another requisite beside knowing what to do: How to do it. There is the soil for the seed, the human heart; he should know it, its law of thought, its deep-seated passions, its specific needs; men in the aggregate; the relation of man to man, what it is, what it ought to be; the sociological questions, those mighty problems that have rent society from center to circumference. He plants with far less efficiency who stands in wilful ignorance of the soil, with which his message has so much to do.

Then God places within reach of the student lines of study that will throw a light upon the sacred page, interpreting and fortifying above his highest conception. There are the languages that will yield to him veritable nuggets of gold; history will

draw its arm across the ages and lay at his feet its solemn lessons; science, the hand-maid of religion, will offer its contributions, which are increasingly forming a mighty buttress to our faith; the archaeologist is slowly turning the rocky-page—the Lord's latest commentary on His written revelation—and with glad hearts we are reading anew God's wonders in ages past. These are the soil, the conditions, the environs of our tremendous task, growing essentials to real efficiency, short of which none who appreciate the dignity of the office will want to come. We have yielded too long Science, Art, Philosophy to the agnostic and scorner. Who has a better right to go out beneath a beneficent sun, and, casting his eye upward, outward and downward, claim it all as his own, than the minister of the Gospel? The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof. Set his foot where he will he is on his Maker's soil. Touch what law he will he has discovered the Lord's statute. The correct voice of science is none other than the voice of God. The planets in their rhythmic circuits tell of Him; the early dew-drop, of mercy fresh every morning; the flowers and birds, of a Father who spreads his table daily for the world's children. This (the Bible) is our message, but all these are closely related subjects, a knowledge of which will make more intelligible to us and others the one theme upon our tongue. We are to make them willing tributaries which shall intensify our love for and power in the race we must run before men.

Ministerial Education is magnificent in its range and sublime in its limitation. The Church is called at present to go forth and lay her hand upon the progress, facilities and achievements of the world and chain them as bound captives to the Conqueror.

ARTICLE VII.

SHALL WOMEN PREACH IN THE CONGREGATION? AN
EXEGETICAL TREATISE.

BY PROFESSOR J. L. NEVE, D.D.

There are mainly three passages of Paul dealing with this question and whether it shall be answered in the negative or in the affirmative a careful exegesis of these three Pauline passages will have to decide. Other words of Scripture incidentally touching upon this theme always will have to be interpreted in the light of the words of Paul to the Corinthians and to Timothy, where he in an unmistakable language establishes a rule not for one congregation only but "for all the assemblies of the saints" (1 Cor. 14 : 33).

The first passage we have is 1 Cor. 11 : 4-16. In verse 5 it reads: "But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoreth her head;" and in the 13th verse: "Judge in yourselves: is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered?" These verses show that in the meetings of the Corinthian Christians the women also took part in prophesying and praying.* This, Paul does not forbid here; he denounces only the manner in which they do it; neglecting to cover their head. Here we ask: Did not Paul then tacitly permit the women to prophesy and pray in public meetings? Meyer pointing to chapter 14 : 34, where silence is imposed upon them and to 1 Timothy 2 : 12, where they are forbidden to teach, says, it has to be taken into account that in these two passages the public assembly of the congregation as such, the whole *ἐκκλησία*, is spoken of. There is no sign of such being the case here where he does not forbid the prophete-

*It must have been public meetings which Paul has in view here, because, 1, "prophesying" does not suit the idea of *private* devotion of a husband and wife, and, 2, the whole passage presupposes publicity. Paul wants the women to avoid public occasion of offense which they would give if they prophesy or pray with their head uncovered. Compare Meyer.

syng and praying of the women, and at the same time can not mean *family* worship simply. Therefore Paul here must mean smaller meetings for devotion in the congregation, more limited circles assembled for worship, such as fall under the category of a church in the house (compare chapter 16 : 19; Rom. 16 : 5; Coll. 4 : 15). Paul's readers understood just what kind of meetings were meant, because he wrote on the basis of the information received from the Christians in Corinth.

The second passage is 1 Cor. 14 : 34-36. 34. "As in all churches of the saints, let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience as also says the law." 35. "And if they will learn anything let them ask their husbands at home; for it is a shame (*αἰσχρὸν* unbecoming, disgraceful) for women to speak in the church." 36. "What? came the word of God out from you? or came it unto you only."

Here in plain words Paul demands that the "women keep silence in the churches," "as in all assemblies of the saints." Meyer insists upon connecting the last clause of verse 33 with the beginning of 34 and reads (with Luther and with Weizsaecker in his careful translation of the New Testament) as quoted above. Note that Paul here speaks of a speaking of the women in the public congregation, in the *ἐκκλησία*. Some very modern exegetes have tried to evade the simple and obvious meaning of Paul's words by pointing to the word *speaking*, *λαλεῖν*, in verse 34. They say *speaking* is not *teaching*, and then they interpret that the women at Corinth had harmed the peace of the congregation by too much talking and gossiping, and that Paul here was forbidding only such unedifying and frivolous conversation. Is such an interpretation admissible? Five counter-arguments speak against it:

1. Nowhere in the letters of Paul to the Corinthians is there any indication that the peace of the congregation was especially disturbed by too much talk of the women.

2. True, *λαλεῖν* can have the meaning of mere talking, of

simply employing the organs of speech; but it can also mean exactly the same as teaching. An example is Romans 7 : 1 "For I speak (*λαλῶ*) to them that know the law." There is therefore no reason why speaking here can not mean teaching, preaching.

3. From the remark verse 34, "it is not permitted unto them to speak; *but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also says the law*" we see that Paul means here speaking as an act of independence. The woman shall be subject to her husband and *therefore* shall not speak publicly in the church, which is unbecoming to her. This argument would not suit the idea of Paul merely forbidding the women to become engaged in talking, gossiping.

4. According to verse 35 the women, in the public congregation, shall not ask questions even for their own instruction, but shall go with such questions to their husbands at home. Therefore Paul must mean public speaking (putting questions) in the services of the congregation where religious instruction was given and received, and can not refer to indiscriminate talking.

5. With his remark in verse 36 Paul wants to say: The church at Corinth is not the mother church, having the right to establish customs for other churches. Neither is she the only one existing. The same gospel has gone to others who then would also have the right to originate customs and peculiar habits. And what a confusion and disorder that would bring into the Church if every individual congregation was permitted to introduce new customs in questions like this? These words would be unintelligible if Paul here meant nothing but idle talk on the part of the women.

Now we come to the third passage: 1 Timothy 2 : 12-14.

12. "But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. 13. "For Adam was first formed, then Eve." 14. "And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression."

"But I suffer not a woman *to teach*." Here we have

διδάσκειν. Again Paul takes the public teaching (preaching) of the women in the congregation as an act of independence, which is contrary to divine economy. For a woman to teach in the congregation (in our language, to fill the pulpit) is an "usurping authority over the man," that stands in contradiction to a fact established at the time of the Creator and emphasized after the fall because of the part woman took in it.

Then it weighs something that Paul denounces the public teaching of women in the congregation not only in his letter to the Corinthians, but also in his *pastoral* letter to Timothy where, in a language stronger than that used over against the Corinthians, he gives to his co-laborer instructions not to one church merely but to the practice "in all the assemblies of the saints."

There are people who say: If Paul would live to day and in America he would speak differently. He wrote his instructions on the background of his age with its conceptions of inferiority of the female sex. Such apostolic teachings, they say, must be taken in an historical sense. Now this interpretation would be all right in the mouth of a champion of modern theology; but one who does not want to give up the formal principle of the Reformation, namely that the Holy Scripture is source and rule for all faith and practice can not afford to take that view. If we can not believe that in a question like the one here under consideration Paul, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, said something that is true and binding to-day just as well as at the time of the founding of the Church, then we are on dangerous ground; then we can not with Peter say that we have a "sure word of prophesy" (2 Pet. 1 : 19). If we have the right to interpret thus and so get rid of something that does not suit the taste of our age, what then can we answer if, for instance, a champion of "free love" attacks the institution of marriage, saying that such requirements of the Bible do not hold for our day?

We sum up: A careful exegesis always will show beyond all doubt that in 1 Cor. 14 : 34-36 and in 1 Tim. 2 : 12-14 Paul forbids the women to preach in the church. In 1 Cor.

11:4-16 where he does not forbid them to prophesy and to pray, merely criticizing the manner in which they did it, Paul must have a speaking of the women in view that did not take place in the ἐκκλησία, in the public assembly of the congregation, but in smaller meetings for devotion. Specifying among the different species of services of a Christian congregation of to-day, from the public preaching in the pulpit down to Sunday school and womans' missionary meeting, true Christian tact will always easily find what a woman can do without breaking in upon that ground rule of creation which Paul in the above passages has re-established.

ARTICLE VIII.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

BY REV. L. J. MOTSCHMAN, A.M.

This subject naturally, according to "mortal mind," falls, or is believed to fall, into two thoughts. First, Is Christian Science tenable? and, secondly, Has it been a blessing to humanity? Let us look at these in their order.

IS CHRISTIAN SCIENCE TENABLE?

According to the Standard Dictionary, a thing is tenable when it is "capable of being held, maintained or defended." If this be true of the so-called Christian Science, it must be tenable, both as being a science, and as being Christian. The first question to consider, therefore, is, whether it is a science, and if so, of what is it a science?

At this point it is in order to acquaint the reader, in a few words, with the reputed author of this remarkable philosophy. The one who claims credit for this cult is Mrs. Mary Glover Patterson Eddy. Some believe that Frye should be added to this list of names. She was born about eighty-six years ago, that is, if we may trust "mortal mind." She herself dates her

existence from some time near the flood. No one may properly say she is older than that, for she herself says, "Never having dated my existence before the flood." She further declares that, like Samuel, she heard the voice of the Lord call her by name when she was only eight years old. Notwithstanding all this, the first fifty years of her life, according to "mortal mind," was spent in complete insignificance. During part of this time she was a second-rate spiritualist medium, giving public seances, for money, in and about Boston.

Mr. Glover, of whom his one-time widow says: "Whose tender devotion to his young wife was remarked by all observers," soon died and his earthly remains are said to be in the Potter's Field at Wilmington, N. C. Her second marriage, an alliance with Mr. Patterson, was terminated by divorce decree of the court. This was secured, according to the word of a brother, while the husband was a war prisoner, having been captured at the battle of Bull Run. Mrs. Eddy's story is that he run off with another woman.

The successor of the lamented Glover and the departed Patterson, was Asa G. Eddy. After a few years of rough sailing upon the matrimonial seas, he too was gathered to his fathers. In December, 1878, he was indicted for conspiracy to murder a Mr. Spofford, at whom Mrs. Eddy had a grudge, and whom she failed to kill mentally, after soliciting the aid of a number of powerful Christian Scientists to aid her.

Whether she is now a widow is a matter of dispute. Mr. Frye is ostensibly her servant, but surely a very honored servant. He is her footman and private secretary. He holds the legal title to the mansion in which they live. He is the owner of all her lands, horses, carriages and jewels. Of course, all this does not make him her husband, but are evident signs of a "suspicious relation." Of course, Mrs. Eddy does not believe in marriage, presumably for others. Her benevolence here passes all understanding, for it is evident she did all that lay in her power to keep other women from getting married. Mrs. Eddy has one son, who lives in the West, but who seldom comes to see his illustrious mother. Some years ago her de-

sire for children became so strong, specially for little boys, that she was constrained to adopt a male infant who was only forty years old, and whose love for an adopted mother was such an overmastering passion that he forsook a wife and two children in Vermont. What love for mother! And we may add, What love for wife and children! He took the name of E. J. Foster-Eddy.

Mrs. Eddy is now an old woman surrounded by all the comfort that money can command. She has a long, thin, wiry face, with eyes sharply set, a mouth that indicates anything but generosity, and with hard lines of greed and selfishness crossing her face. The pictures which are sold with her endorsement, are not pictures of herself, but of a crayon representing a woman more than forty years younger than Mrs. Eddy. This is done to maintain the notion that Christian Science is the fountain of perpetual youth.

Now this is the woman who claims in partnership with God to be the author of Christian Science, or the book entitled: *Science and Health, With Key to the Scriptures*. In our study of this subject we have no need to consult anything else but this book, for it is claimed that it only has divine authority and contains the whole truth and nothing but the truth. It is humbly admitted that the Bible contains some truth, but that it cannot be found in the midst of so much error without this "Key." Let us now seek an answer to our question.

IS IT A SCIENCE?

Science is exact and systematized knowledge, gained by exact observations and correct thinking.

Mrs. Eddy most emphatically claims that she has furnished the world with really the only truly scientific book. "Christian Science," she says, "differs from material science, but not on that account is it less scientific. Christian Science is preeminently scientific, being based on Truth, the Principle of all science" (p. 17). Truth and Principle are here and everywhere spelled by her with a capital, because used as synonymous with God.

She does not claim that she has a physical science, for all such sciences she denominates "A blind belief." This is made necessary by her fundamental dogma that there is in reality no physical or material existence. This dogma tells the whole story of her book. What we call matter is but an image in "mortal mind," which in turn is nothing but the absence of "Immortal Mind." Strange that that which does not have existence still has the power to create images. Not only so, but it is the cause of all sin, sickness and death. And not only all this, but this non-existing unreality, this absence of something is also the prolific cause of all destructive phenomena in a non-existing nature, or one which is but the idea of God. There is no force in matter and God will not cause a storm, or volcanic eruption, hence there is but one cause, "mortal mind." Thus one explains the recent bad behavior of Mt. Pelee. In face of every sort of evidence they must assert Mrs. Eddy's dogma. "The non-existence of matter." So one goes on to "state the Christian Science thought in regard to the Martignique disaster." And thus he continues, "God is good and God is all. There is no storm, no fire, no flood, no earthquake." "God never made those things and they are therefore unrealities." "Why then did God permit the destruction of St. Pierre? He did not, and we hold, further, knew nothing about it." "How did it happen? As everything evil happens, through an erring human sense of things." "The thought of centuries has been along the lines of human belief, and hence we have storms, fire, flood, earthquake, tidal waves, all nursed along in human belief until they now seem as real and powerful as though God had created them." "The law of earthquakes and other like phenomena is human made." Let us trust that God did not make this colossal fool. But the above is exactly what Mrs. Eddy teaches (pp. 12 and 13.) Her position is that God did not create matter and therefore it does not exist. Hence God is not responsible for any imaginary storms within the realm of matter. But God must have created the being who is able to believe that these disasters are realities and therefore He would be equally responsible for any consequence. What

she means by "mortal belief" is impossible to say. She says (p. 178): "Whatever indicates the opposite to God, or His absence, is only a mortal belief; and this belief is neither the mind nor body of man."

She calls her incoherent verbiage a metaphysical science. But this very term, which we get from Aristotle, signifies "after, or with the physical." It therefore recognizes the physical. She therefore has not given us a metaphysical science. Has she given us a pure psychology? This she makes impossible by the sweeping dogma that "the human consciousness is false."

If consciousness is false then we cannot say that anything is a fact. If we must reject the facts of consciousness in one thing then we cannot rely on them in anything. If the consciousness of pain is a lie, every other consciousness must be classed as its brother. We have here, therefore, the most absolute know-nothing agnosticism possible to conceive. Mrs. Eddy could not get out of this dilemma by saying that she has given us a science not of mortal, but of Immortal Mind, for she deals altogether with the errors of mortal mind. We may also add that without consciousness we can have no science of immortal mind. The notion that there are two minds in man, even though one is a thinking nothing, is pure dogma, for mind is conscious of itself only as a unit.

Neither has she given us a moral, or judicial science. Even if she accepted the reliability of consciousness, there could be no moral, or judicial science, for her dogma is: "There is no sin, there is no evil; all is God and God is all." Even if man could do evil, which is impossible (of course we must not call to mind, at this point, that she charged one with stealing her copyright) it would be impossible to punish him, for there is no pain and there are no prison walls. All that the supposed criminal need do is not to cherish the mortal belief in regard to these things.

Another thing that should be here mentioned is that if the so-called Christian Science is truly scientific, it would have to be shown that the effects claimed to be produced by it, never and nowhere fail, and that they are not and cannot be produced

by any other system. Now this is exactly what is claimed. In both of these respects this claim is untrue. The pathway of Christian Science is lined with complete failures; and the cures which are effected by it, are also effected by any system of mind healing. When Mrs. Eddy claims that she has, or can demonstrate her theory, she gives the lie to her fundamental dogma, that there is no matter, that the five senses are false and that we can get no knowledge by them. She says: "I have healed a cancer that had so eaten the flesh of the neck as to expose the jugular vein so that it stood out like a cord." How did she get into possession of all these wonderful facts? Did some one tell her? Did she see it? Did she feel the hole or cord? The point is evident. Either she is false in her claims here, or her whole system is false. If you consult the index of her book on the subject of the senses, you will find this: "Their evidence never to be accepted." "Their evidence to be reversed." What indescribable nonsense all this is! When I think I see an object then I do not see it; and when I think I do not see it then I do see it. Then when Mrs. Eddy thought she had cured the cancer she caused a cancer, for that is inverting the testimony of the senses. No Christian Scientist ever lives a single day without contradicting the fundamental dogma of this nauseating cult. There is no cure effected by its practice that has not been duplicated by other methods which do not require us to throw away every vestige of reason in order to accept them. The only thing that any of these prove is the power of mind over body, but not an absolute power. This no intelligent man of to-day denies, except the advocates of this cult. On this point she says, referring to the book on mind healing: "They regard the human mind as a healing agent; whereas this mind is not a factor in the Principle of Christian Science." Thus the only bit of fact that can be found in this whole brush-pile of philosophical scraps, is thrown out. We must therefore conclude that it is not a science in any sense, but a most absurd piece of nonsense. We may now ask,

IS IT CHRISTIAN?

That only is Christian which accepts and conforms to the Bible, especially the New Testament. What is the relation of "Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures" to the Bible? Ostensibly it professes to be a spiritual explanation of the Bible. Upon investigation, we find that there is not a shadow of truth in this pretension. A more infamous falsehood has never been told. She does not claim equality with the Bible for her book, but superiority. It is first and its authority is final. The Bible is not even recommended to her blind followers, but all are commanded to possess and read her book, and give their time gratis to sell it. Where did she get this book? In one place she says that God gave it to her by special revelation, while at another place she says she discovered it. In which place, if in either, has she told the truth? Look at her claim to having it by revelation. In January of 1901 she said: "I should blush to write of 'Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures' as I have, were it of human origin, and I apart from God its author; but as I was only a scribe echoing the harmonies of heaven in divine metaphysics, I cannot be supermodest of the Christian Science text-book." Absurd and presumptuous as this statement is, some 50,000 people in the United States believe it, and worship this wicked woman more than Jesus. Her book is accepted in all things as the word of God just as much as the Bible is accepted in anything as that word. Judas-like it comes to the Scriptures with a "Key," but which in reality is a deadly dagger, covered with the rust of infidelity. The sole purpose of the book is to satisfy the greed of Mrs. Eddy, and to do this it must destroy the authority of the Bible, and this it seeks in every conceivable way to do.

The contents of the book itself will furnish all the evidences needed by any one who still has a bit of mortal mind left, after reading it, that God has had nothing to do with it. It is utterly devoid of all merits as literature, science, philosophy, or religion. But, possibly, she may have told the truth when she

said that she discovered it about 1866. A woman existing ever since the flood ought to discover something. Let us look into this claim. Bear in mind that she says she consulted no other book or writing, except the Bible.

In 1836 mesmerism was introduced in the United States by the Frenchman, Charles Poyan. In 1840 a Mr. P. P. Quinby was healed by him and soon became its most successful representative. His reputation soon spread and among the people who came to him was a Mrs. Glover Patterson. She was treated by him and healed, or at least she was very much helped. In 1862 she said: "I can see dimly at first, and as trees walking, the great principle which underlies Dr. Quinby's faith and works; and just in proportion to my right perception of truth is my recovery. This truth which he opposed to the error of giving intelligence to matter changes the currents of the system. The truth which he establishes in the patient cures him. This is a science capable of demonstration to those who reason upon the process." Dr. Quinby died January 16, 1866. Some time after this Mrs. Patterson fell upon the ice, which caused her considerable trouble. She wrote to Julius A. Dresser, who had been a close friend of Quinby, to come and heal her, urging that he was the only one who could take up the work of Quinby. Remember this was in 1862. Now let us pass on to 1883 and see what the same woman says: "We had laid the foundation of mental healing long before we ever saw Dr. Quinby. We made our first experience in mental healing about 1853, when we were convinced that mind had a science which, if understood, would heal all diseases." We can only say that this is an unadulterated piece of falsehood from lips which are evidently well versed in the art.

It has but recently been learned that Quinby left numerous manuscripts to which Mrs. Eddy had access, for copies made by her and given to friends have been found. In these manuscripts is found everything that can be found in her book, except the claim that it is a revelation. During the years 1868-'70 Mrs. Eddy lived at Stoughton, Mass., a fact she never tells. During these years she openly declared herself to be a disciple

and student of Quinby, and gave, or sold his manuscripts to her pupils. We have the testimony of the woman with whom she lived in 1864 to the effect that she spent many hours during the day questioning Quinby about the details of his system and writing them out at length in the evening. Let us then remember that Mrs. Eddy herself gives the whole credit for the discovery of this system to Dr. Quinby as late as 1870. Here is a brief extract of a copy of one of Quinby's manuscripts; it would not sound more natural if it were taken from her book: "Wisdom, Love and Truth is the principle of the idea and is health. Error is matter and all the sickness that can be is in it, for all would be harmony and health if controlled by Truth. Matter being but a belief, is constantly changing. To give intelligence to matter is an error which is sickness. This is all that can be sickness, viz., an error standing as science. Thus error is sickness. Truth is health. Error is matter. Truth is God. Etc." From this it will be seen that Dr. Quinby and not Mrs. Eddy discovered Christian Science. That does not make the thing any better, for both were illiterate, but Dr. Quinby was an honest man. Of course intelligence is of no benefit to Christian Scientists. On this point Mrs. Eddy says:

"No intellectual proficiency is necessary in the learner." Verily this is true.

As early as 1862, she says, "I began to write down and give to friends the results of my scriptural study." Perhaps this is true, but they were likely the scriptures of Dr. Quinby.

It follows, therefore, that she got her book, neither by revelation, or by discovery, but by a lumbering piece of plagiarism.

But is it Christian, no matter whose work it is? Does it agree with the Bible? There is no fundamental doctrine of the Bible which is not denied in this book. We must necessarily be brief in establishing this charge. Let us turn our attention to her "Key," which does not unlock, but locks the Scriptures. She refers to the Old Testament as "The history of perpetual evil," and added that there is a "preponderance of unreality in the whole narrative." "The Book of Genesis is

the history of the untrue image of God, named mortal man." "The spiritual import of the Word often seems so smothered as to require explication." What do such statements mean, other than that the Old Testament is unreliable?

To how much of the Bible does she give us a "Key"? To the first four chapters of Genesis, part of the twelfth chapter of Revelation and to the twenty-first chapter of the same book, also to the twenty-third Psalm and to the Lord's Prayer.

Let us look at a few of these spiritual interpretations: Gen. 1 : 1, "Beginning," she says, "means the eternal verity and unity of God and man, including the universe." "The creative Principle—Life, Truth and Love—is God."

"Creation consists of the unfolding of spiritual ideas." Here she denies both the proper personality of God and the doctrine of an objective creation.

On Gen. 1 : 12, she says: "Christian Science, the Word of God, sayeth to the darkness upon the face of error, 'God is All-in-all.'" Here is a bright idea, but a flat contradiction of the text on Gen. 1 : 11, "The tree or herb does not yield fruit because of any propagating principle of its own, but because it reflects the mind which includes all." The tree and herb must therefore be forms of Mind, or of God. Again she tells us, "The seed is in itself, only as Mind is all and produces all. Mind is the multiplier, and Mind's idea, the universe, the product." Mind, or God, which is the same thing, is therefore both the creator and the creation. There is no existence objective to God. God is all and all is God. Where could you find a more grossly physical conception of God? A vessel that is full cannot be made fuller, we are told, so if God is all, there cannot be anything beside Him. As if God were measured and weighed as one buys potatoes and salt. God neither fills space, nor is His life computed by the almanac. If the language in Gen. 1 : 11, 12, means anything, it signifies that plant life is self propagating. On 1 : 14, we have this strange wisdom: "This text gives the idea of the refraction of thought as it ascends higher." "The periods of spiritual understanding are the days and seasons of Mind's creations." How extremely spiritual is her interpretation of Gen. 1 : 20: "The

fowls correspond to aspirations soaring beyond and above corporeality." Strange that Moses did not see so evident a fact.

Time does not permit us to look at any more of these Scripture contradictions. No sane person can accept them as even an effort at explanation. It is putting something else into the place of the plain statements of God's Word.

When she comes to the second chapter of Genesis, she declares everything from verse six on "Error's story." It is "false history." Contradicts all that has gone before. "It records Pantheism, as opposed to the supremacy of divine spirit." "In this erroneous theory, matter takes the place of spirit." "The lie claims to be Truth." "Is it the truth, or is it a lie? It must be the latter." Now we confess our contempt for the man who professes to be a Christian, and who allows one who is an utter stranger to the truth, to call Moses a liar. But one thing is true, either Mrs. Eddy's stolen book is a falsehood from start to finish, or there is no truth in the Bible.

Her treatment of Revelation is of the same character as that of Genesis. Her book is the "mighty angel" referred to in the tenth chapter. There are no angels in reality, what the Bible calls such, are only messages. She herself is the woman spoken of in Rev. 12 : 1. The goal of Christian Science is reached only by those who believe this abomination. Commenting upon 12 : 5, if we bear in mind that she claims that the female idea is superior to the male, she makes herself superior to Jesus. "This immaculate idea, represented first by man and last by woman, will baptize with fire."

Let me give you her "spiritual version" of the Lord's Prayer. One should think that she would have kept her unholy and wicked hands off this, but she has not. "Our Father-Mother God, all-harmonious, Adorable One. Thy kingdom is come, God is ever present and omnipotent. Enable us to know, as in heaven, so in earth, God is all in all. Give us grace for today; feed Thou the famished affections; and divine Love is reflected in love; And Love leadeth us not in temptation, but delivereth us from evil, sin, disease and death. For God is Substance, Intelligence, Life, Truth, Love."

In her chapter on prayer she rejects every scriptural teaching on the subject. There is no use of praying to God, for He cannot do more than love us. He is not moved by our prayers. "Audible prayer is impressive, but does it produce any lasting benefit?" This she answers in the negative. There is no good in praying for the sick. She says: "The only beneficial effect of such prayer is on the human mind, making it act more powerfully on the body, through a blind faith in God." "A belief in the unknown casting out a belief in sickness."

We have thus shown that this so-called Christian Science, is neither science, nor Christian, but unchristian nonsense.

HAS IT BEEN A BLESSING TO HUMANITY?

That depends on circumstances. Humanity is a very queer thing. What is sweet to one is bitter to another. That which would give a sane man a severe attack of seasickness, would make a fool happy. Christian Science has been a veritable fool's paradise. The happiest lot of people you can think of are such as thought they were sick and have discovered that they were only fooled by mortal mind. The world is full of people who imagine they are sick, when there is nothing the matter with them. For such Christian Science may be a blessing. They have only changed beliefs. Nothing ailed them and nothing cured them, blessed be nothing.

If we take for granted the claims of Christian Science we must certainly say that it has been a great blessing. In fact, about the only thing that has been a blessing. In the hey-day of its glory, "The less mind there is manifested in matter, the better. When the unthinking lobster loses its claw, it grows again. If the science of life were understood, it would be found that the senses of Mind are never lost, and that matter has no sensation. Then the human limb would be replaced as readily as the lobster's claw—not with an artificial limb, but with a genuine one" (pp. 384 and 5). What a blessing that will be to humanity. The amputation of a mere mortal belief-leg will have naught but pleasure in anticipation, when we are assured that a genuine one will soon grow in its place. The funny thing about this is that in case the lobster has a leg cut

off that it does not grow out again, and he is no better off than poor mortal man, who when he loses a finger nail has it replaced by a genuine one, but when it is a leg, the only one that he can get is an artificial one.

How great the blessing of the science that will make us as warm in a January blizzard as a June-day bride, or as cool on the fourth day of July as at Christmas. "If only this science were established," then "heat would pass from the body as painless as gas when it evaporates" (p. 374). In that day the fireman's job, as also that of the husband will be a very delightful one. There will be no more fires to kindle, or ashes to clean out. It will then be seen that "heat and cold are products of mind" (p. 373).

All this nonsense we can stand and in face of it we may say: "Where ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise." If a booby meet a booby coming through the rye, if a booby kiss a booby, need a body cry? But when this awful falsehood leads mothers and fathers to allow their little children, too young to decide for themselves, to burn up with a fever and to die in awful pain without turning a hand to relieve them, and even refusing kind friends to bring in aid, then we say that, if there is not, there ought to be, a place of righteous retribution.

ARTICLE IX.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN.

BY REV. M. COOVER, A.M.

Some reflections on evolution and science as echoes from the meeting of the Zoological Section of the American Association which was held in Washington in January of this year are given by Dr. George Macloskie in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for April.

It is possible for an hypothesis to solve many mysteries and to explain natural forces and products so as to construct a most orderly system of knowledge, and yet not be able to serve as an answer to all the riddles of the universe. Evolution is found a master key to unlock many chambers of knowledge, yet it has not satisfactorily opened the door to human life, nor has it been able to conduct the earthly pilgrim into any assurance beyond the closed door terminating conscious physical existence. Science has not yet eliminated the creative factor in its teaching of origins. Evolution may account for man's physical structure and properties, but the intellectual and spiritual powers of man call for an independent explanation. Science may explain the evolution, but Revelation brings to knowledge the higher creative factor. Biologists all believe that man has been evolved, but just how, is a mystery yet. Professor Macloskie says, "Whatever may be the possibilities or probabilities, there is no difference of view among the scientists as to the matter of fact that the evolution of man is not yet scientifically established."

Comparison of the human brain capacity with that of monkeys has been the favorite method of showing the descent of man; but it has led to unsafe deductions, for not only cranial

capacity is a factor for study and solution, but the whole anatomical structure of man and monkey must be taken into account. Topinard, the French anthropological specialist, shows that while the foot of man and the posterior hand of the monkey are alike specialized and fixed, it is in opposite directions, and one is not derivable from the other. "It is manifestly impossible that the human species can be simian as to its brain, and anti-simian as to the limbs: and hence very reluctantly, and we might say sometimes with wry faces, the best biologists have been abandoning the simian ancestry."

Haeckel sought to eliminate the difficulty by taking the lemurs as an unspecialized order of primates from which both man and monkey were derived. But Haeckel blundered, for the lemurs are void of the "discoïd placentation" which is characteristic of both man and monkeys.

Evolution as a law in the conduct of nature may be used deductively to explain the origins of structure, but as an explanation of man's complete personality we await the proof of facts. Though man be evolved, yet his probable physical descent even has not been consonously and indubitably ascertained.

In the *Biblical World* for June Dr. Masterman, a visitor to Jerusalem, gives an interesting account of the work of excavation by Mr. Macalister, of the Palestine Exploration Fund, on the site of ancient Gezer. This ancient site with its traces of a pre-historic cave-dwelling race using flint instruments and cremating its dead, dating from pre-Amorite days to the turbulent times of the warring Maccabees, is furnishing most valuable findings. At least seven periods of occupation are evidenced by the remains. Four walls were successively built about the city; the first an earth wall of the Amorite period, in the Abrahamic, or pre-Abrahamic age, built by a people using bronze implements in their rude forms of art, a religiously degraded race devoted to phallic worship. This mound boundary was succeeded by a rude stone wall constructed probably in the Tell el-Amarna correspondence period, a wall which

closed burial caves in which remains of bodies are yet found *in situ*.

Another massive stone wall fourteen feet thick with corner towers was built most likely in the age of Solomon, and probably by a Pharaoh; and lastly within this boundary a still greater wall was constructed by the hands of the sturdy Macabees.

Besides the interesting findings in the caves and cisterns consisting both of works of art and of human remains, the most sensational discovery is that of a megalithic temple of Baal consisting of eight uncovered monoliths, ranging from five to eleven feet in height, constructed in the days of the Amorite or Canaanite occupation.

Near the Baal shafts is a large stone socket used as a pedestal for the wooden pole erected as an Asherah. Here were conducted the orgies of the sensualistic worship condemned by Jehovah to destruction at the hands of the invading Israelites; some forms of which worship, however, continued to later periods of Israelitish occupancy, and received the most severe denunciations of the prophets of Israel.

Not far from these monoliths numerous jars have been unearthed, each containing the skeleton of a newly-born infant. The sacrifice of the first born was apparently associated with this sensual worship of Baal and Astarte. The higher Semitic religious conception of the Hebrew race, though allied to the general customs of Semitic orientalism, is manifested in the humane law of the redemption of the first born. The site of Gezer has furnished as yet the most encouraging and profitable excavations in Palestine.

The Expository Times for June contains numerous suggestive archeological and expository notes.

The spirit of Paul, the apostle to the gentiles, manifests itself in his companion and fellowworker, Luke. And Luke in his Gospel presents Jesus as the friend of gentile and Samaritan. He takes pleasure in selecting and recording those parables of Jesus which show favor to the classes which the haughty Jews despised.

In his *Jesu Muttersprache* Dr. Arnold Meyer adds another instance of Luke's selective attention in respect of the wide sympathy of Jesus.

Of the many lepers Elisha cures one, a man outside the Israelitish fold, Naaman, the Syrian; and of the widows of penury, Elijah helps one, a Syrophenician woman; Hebrew, or gentile? The Peshita has gentile, and the Palestinian Syriac, gentile; but the Estrangelo-Syriac palimpsest has "widow." Mrs. Lewis notes in her translation of the latter, that the shortening of one letter would give "heathen" instead of "widow." Dr. Meyer emends the text of Luke 4 : 26, and shows the appreciation of Jesus of the faith of the gentile world. Jesus significantly notes the action of Israel's earliest prophets, Elijah and Elisha, ministering to Syrians.

It has been the teaching of the Higher Critics that the early Hebrews were polytheists, and that the first commandment, in its traditional time, is an anachronism. Even Elijah at best was but a henotheist, since the conception of pure monotheism did not arise until the prophets Amos and Hosea. To Elijah Jahweh was the greatest of gods, but, "besides him there is none other," is a sentiment lacking in the earliest prophetic teaching. But Babylonia is the historic mother of Semitic conceptions, and among the early Babylonians apparently Marduk was the sole god, and not merely supreme among the gods. The other gods mentioned in the Babylonian Pantheon are but modal manifestations of the one god Marduk.

Dr. Pinches in translation of a fragment of a Babylonian Cuneiform tablet discovered that when "Marduk is to be thought of as the Possessor of Power, he is called Ninib; when he is the Lord of Battle he is Nergal; when he is Possessor of Lordship he is Bel; when he is Lord of Business he is Nebo; when he is Illuminator of Night he is Sin; when Lord of all he is Shamash; and when God of Rain he is called Addu."

The asserted illiteracy of the Mosaic age has been silently

dropped; and now monotheism appears before the Abrahamic age. It is well not to be too critically dogmatic.

"There are more things in heaven and earth than our philosophy has dreamed of," and the conjecture of Colonel Conder is at least a possibility. Were the ten commandments written in alphabetic letters? Colonel Conder thinks not. The age of Moses was an age of Cuneiform writing. The Tell el-Amarna correspondence, 1400 B. C., shows the literary form of the period to have been cuneiform.

Were the two tables of the law chiseled stone, or man-made stone—brick? Colonel Conder thinks they were bricks covered with cuneiform characters, and that the Pentateuchal history and legislation was at the first engraved on bricks. The Phoenician characters came into use at the time of the early Hebrew monarchy, and then a transliteration was made from cuneiform to Phoenician script.

It was in this transliteration from cuneiform to alphabetic Hebrew that scribal inefficiency through uncritical literalness transcribed the duplicate divine names, Jahweh, and Elohim, upon which the documentary hypothesis of the structure of the Pentateuch is based. Professor Sayce, however, expresses the opinion that the author of the Genesis story had in mind the Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic which gave rise to the duplicate divine names. Colonel Conder's theory places the cuneiform and alphabetic scripts side by side in the age of Hezekiah. But the Siloam Inscription of that period, as well as the Moabite Stone, *circa* 850 B. C., are solely in alphabetic writing. We await a brick from the Pentateuchal library.

The man with the most names may be the least known. Who was Lebbeus, Thaddeus, Judas of James, the Judas, not Iscariot, of the apostolate? In the apocryphal *Acta Thomae* and the Syrian *Doctrina Apostolorum*, as well as in the Abgar legend by Eusebius, there is prominent mention of one "Judas Thomas." Tradition says that the apostle Thomas was a brother of our Lord, and even that he was a twin brother, for

Thomas is not a name, but a title, and means "twin," so that Thomas was somebody's twin brother. The Syriac document calls him "Twin of the Messiah, and Apostle of the Most High." A later Syrian tradition identifies Thomas with Thaddeus. Who then was "Judas Thomas?"

Mrs. Agnes Smith Lewis offers a conjecture that he was a brother of Jesus, a twin brother of James the Lord's brother. The apostolic names Judas and Thomas refer to one individual, and "Judas Thomas" is Jude, the author of the Epistle bearing that name. If Jude was brother of James, he was brother of our Lord. Though he might distinguishingly and rightly claim himself brother of our Lord, he yet describes himself in his Epistle as brother of James. This seems to Mrs. Lewis to signify Jude's closer relation to James of twin brother.

None of the Lord's brethren believed on him during his earthly ministry, for though Jude, his brother, was an apostle, he was Judas Thomas, the doubting apostle, who vacillated in his faith. Mrs. Lewis asks that her words be taken only suggestively and not dogmatically.

The seemingly deceitful "borrowing" of gold and silver jewels by the Israelites upon their departure from Egypt has been the cause of some critical anxiety on the part of not a few Christians. The incident makes questionable the morality of the people of Israel, and also casts a most serious reflection upon the moral character of Jehovah who commanded the deed. But it is not a serious moral matter after all, but just a matter of our ignorance of oriental customs. The children of Israel did not "borrow," but in accurate translation of the Hebrew, they "asked," and the quality of the asking is very clearly shown by Dr. Trumbull in his *Studies in Oriental Social Life*.

The Israelites impoverished in Egypt were able in the wilderness to bring much golden treasure to Aaron to mould a golden calf; and after the destruction of the idol, were able to furnish great treasures of gold and silver at the call of Moses for the adornment of the temple, or sacred tent. The riches of oriental peoples were almost exclusively worn on the body

as ornaments, or secretly in the garments. Women were laden with bracelets, anklets, rings for fingers, nose and ear, chaplets for the hair, and brooches and chains of coins for the neck. There were no banks for the safe deposit of wealth, and every possessor must care for his own treasure.

A wife might be divorced at any moment at the whim of the husband, and she was then obliged at once to abandon the home, and was dispossessed of all property save what she wore on her own person. Her jewels were her absolute property, and all her personal treasure was worn for bodily adornment. The treasures of jewelry in all European museums, discovered in Egyptian tombs, show the wealth of possessions worn in this form. The traveler in the East to-day finds the same customs yet prevailing in Arabia and Egypt.

"Bakhsheesh" is demanded on every hand for every trivial or useful service. Not only the stipulated pay is expected for promised services, but to prove to all persons, and especially to friends of the servant that the service rendered has been satisfactory, an additional gift is always asked for and given on parting. The neglected and unpaid final bakhsheesh as a parting gift calls forth the deepest wail from the guide or attendant, for the satisfactory character of his service is at stake. The guide who journeyed with Dr. Hilprecht into the Lebanon region was appointed by the Sisters in the hospital of the Knights of St. John, at Beyrout. After the safe return and the payment to the muleteer of the amount agreed upon, the guide asked for additional bakhsheesh. Dr. Hilprecht protestingly said that he had barely money enough to see him back to Alexandretta; but upon insistence he sacrificed his last coin, and went hungry for fifty-two hours in deference to his muleteer, who declared he could not face the Sisters who recommended him unless he showed the gift which was a proof of satisfactory service.

When the people of Israel left Egypt they asked a parting gift. And the Lord said, "I will give this people favor in the sight of the Egyptians: and it shall come to pass, that, when ye go, ye shall not go empty; but every woman shall ask of her neighbor, and of her that sojourneth in her house,

jewels of silver, and jewels of gold, and raiment; and ye shall put them upon your sons, and upon your daughters; and ye shall spoil (carry away the treasures of) the Egyptians." "And they asked of the Egyptians jewels of silver, and jewels of gold, and raiment; and the Lord gave the people favor in the sight of the Egyptians, so that they let them have what they asked." Many of the difficulties of Biblical criticism are explainable by studies in archeology and oriental customs.

The Christian consciousness is a witness-bearer of the truth of our religion. That which is suited to our absolute need, which finds in the world's circumstances of sin an unailing adaptation and adequate power for moral recovery, has a claim to authority for faith in it. But the ultimate ground of Christian certainty is not our personal religious consciousness. That which certifies to the religious consciousness is above that consciousness itself.

If the reality of the divineness and supernaturalness of our Saviour be minimized by naturalistic interpretations of his origin and character, works and profession, our religious consciousness cannot excel the humanistic limitations of our interpreted Redeemer. We may embalm Jesus in all the ethical beauty of a manly character, but if we deny him divinity, and divine properties and powers, we eliminate him from the role of a Saviour.

The most intelligent religious consciousness must see in Jesus divinity. The superhuman character of Jesus is revealed not merely in what he says and does, but in how he does it. His deeds are great not simply in power, but in the wise use of that power.

He is not a Moses with Aaron's wand. He does not turn a river into blood, nor produce a murrain, or a plague. He is unique in goodness as well as power, in wisdom of action as well as might of execution. He is seen to be superhuman not merely in his thoughts and deeds, but under the conditions and forms of exercising them.

None but a divine mind could unerringly choose the proper time, discern the appropriate conditions for action, and abstain

from humanitarian weakness in lavishing unfitting benefactions to men's injury instead of their blessing and salvation. A divinity of wisdom runs through every deed, and every choice of miraculous action. Give a mere man such divine power and who could curb his excesses, and restrain his folly?

Only a Jesus is able to handle the intricacies of perfect action. It takes more than divinity of power to make a Messiah. Mere omnipotence cannot constitute a Savior. It demands pre-eminence in everything that combines to form true character and adequate moral discernment to constitute a Christ for the world's redemption.

We do not see Jesus banishing conditions of penury from society. He would relieve the distress of immediate hunger, but never repeals the condition of human poverty. He taught men to pray for daily, not weekly, bread. He scattered neither drachmas nor denarii to relieve the poor. Yet his miracles are as necessary for human faith as his teaching, for his miracles convey and teach necessary doctrine.

In the sermon on the mount Jesus proclaims his doctrine of righteousness; in his healing miracles he teaches the doctrine of faith. Righteousness, love and hope are taught in the sermon on the mount, but not the principles of faith. This essential element is brought forth in the instruction which miracles teach. Take away the miracles and their moral setting and you practically expunge Jesus' doctrine of faith. His lavish hand and bounteous spontaneity of miraculous benefits were not simply to alleviate promiscuous temporal discomforts, or show forth his divine character. A deep moral purpose is discoverable in his constant calling attention to faith while he works his miraculous deeds. Both word and miracle are absolute essentials for saving doctrine and redemptive efficacy. Only the superhuman can save from human entanglement in subversive, destructive sin. The religious consciousness must be certified to by a greater religious fact.

II.

GERMAN.

BY PROFESSOR S. GRING HEFELBOWER, A.M.

Last year Otto Scheel, Privatdocent in Kiel University, published a pamphlet on *Luther's Attitude to Holy Scripture*, which has called forth considerable comment among theologians, perhaps more because of his interpretations of passages from Luther in the interests of modern biblical criticism, than because of any worth that his booklet may have. In a word, he would make Luther a forerunner of the destructive criticism of to-day in the fullest sense of the word, even going so far as to claim that Luther recognized only a limited authority in the apostles.

He finds in Luther's writings two classes of declarations concerning Scripture; in the one of which Luther establishes the worth of Scripture on religious rather than on historical grounds, while in the other there are mediaeval elements, which, more than the former, are remnants of a past development, and which Luther himself could not perceive as fetters. The former "grew out of Luther's experience of salvation. He finds the word of God in Scriptures, which presents itself to the heart as truth, and thereby loses the character of an external, legal authority". "The content of this Word of God is Christ, a fundamental principle which justifies a religious criticism, even of that which is apostolical". This the author regards as normative for Luther's entire position; in a word, he would make a modern critic out of the Reformer.

Of course he finds some expressions that are apparently contradictory, but they can be explained away. However, his explanations are not satisfactory to all students of Luther's works, and many of his interpretations are regarded as gross misinterpretation. Walther, of Rostock, in No. 19 of the *Theologisches Literaturblatt*, shows clearly that, though Luther often assumed a very free attitude toward Holy Scripture, he was very far from having either the spirit or the methods of the modern critics.

In the next No. of this journal Walther reviews a pamphlet by Pastor Kapp, of Ittenheim in Elsass, on *Religion and Ethics in the Christianity of Luther*, from which we condense the following.

However in noting the tendency of this book and Walther's criticism of it, we must remember that Ritschlianism has emphasized the ethical elements in Christianity at the expense of the doctrinal elements, and that the theological stress of recent decades has lead many theologians to seek in the works of Luther solutions for the many perplexing problems of the day. This last named tendency was probably greatly augmented by the attempts of Ritschl and his followers to use Luther in support of their favorite tenets, and by their criticism of his work as incomplete and needing the finishing hand of Ritschl. The result has been that a great deal of earnest and thorough investigation and discussion has centered about the theme of this pamphlet, and the tendency has generally been away from the extreme positions of Ritschlianism and toward a more conservative, if not the traditional, view.

As to the formulation of the subject of the pamphlet, Walther thinks, with Kapp, "that there is something suspicious connected with approaching historical quantities with theological problems in modern forms". Luther did not speak of religion, but of faith, and knows only one faith, which is the Christian. And Kapp should have informed the reader whether he understood by moral, the attitude of the Christian in all things, or only toward the world and men. However, this is clear, that the thing treated is that which Luther called the relation between faith and good works. It is indeed absolutely necessary to do away with the confusion which Ritschl and Herrmann and their successors brought about by attempting to have Luther answer their problems. Both declared that Luther's derivation of morality from faith was insufficient, and sought to surpass it by another. *The Moral Motive Power of Faith*, by Thieme of Leipzig, is an earnest attempt to present Luther's position fully and objectively. It offered such an abundance of deep thoughts of Luther, which were not sufficiently pondered,

that the mist began to clear away, which the criticism of the Reformer, resulting from a lack of acquaintance with his theology, had produced. Even Herrmann could no longer maintain his former judgment; "However we cannot deny that Luther remained in the path of Catholic tradition in so far that he speaks much too indefinitely of the derivation of good works from faith. If we want to advance on the way of Luther, we must develop in clearer speech also the inner processes, in which the inner life of faith unfolds itself. As a result of this, that Luther solved this problem only imperfectly, the dangerous conception has grown, even in his Church, that an impersonal power, which they claim is present in faith, gives man the capacity to will that which is good." In the third edition of his *Verkehr des Christen mit Gott* he acknowledged that he had learned from Thieme's book "in what richness of conception Luther had grasped this inner process of moral emancipation through faith." Of course his conception of good works differs so widely from that of Luther that all those declarations of Luther concerning the source of good works fail to satisfy him. We have at least advanced so far, that the old objection that Luther is satisfied with the mere assertion "that faith, according to its very nature, must do good works", need not be treated as worthy of further consideration. The chief problem now is, how the different derivations of morality from faith by Luther are to be understood; whether they are to be united, perhaps even to be joined closely into one brief formula, or whether we must consider them as only partly correct and not sufficing.

Kapp treats his subject in three parts. The first presents *The Religious Side of Luther's Christianity*, the fundamental religious character, and the valuation of the ethical within this fundamental conception. The second part presents *The Moral of Luther's Christianity*, which includes both its ethical content and the heights and limitations of his moral understanding. The third section shows *The Combination of the Ethical and the Religious Elements*, the religious basis of the ethical and the genesis of the ethical from the religious. As can be easily

noticed from this arrangement, the author does not belong to the orthodox Lutherans. Therefore it is all the more pleasing that in many respects he gives us more correct information concerning Luther's views than that which we have been accustomed to hear since the time of Ritschl. In many places he comes into close touch with Theime, yet he has a more accurate conception of Luther's teaching concerning the springing of the moral life from faith. We can note here the same course as in Luther's teaching concerning the Scripture. Ritschl presented an entirely new view; his followers accepted it and spread it abroad as irrefutable truth; the investigations of non-Ritschlians, above all that of Lepsius, which were called forth by this, compelled even Harnack, in the third edition of his *History of Doctrine*, to begin a retreat.

Hausleiter, of Greifswald, in a review of the last edition of Juelicher's *New Testament Introduction*, a work of considerable importance, calls attention to the author's marked change in his treatment of the Fourth Gospel. In the first edition he considered John's Gospel a philosophical production with a religious tendency, written probably in the beginning of the second century, hence almost worthless as a source for studying the historical events of Christ's life, but of great value as a primitive source for knowing the early form of the conception of Jesus which was to obtain in the Church later. Juelicher had no exact information concerning the original author, who was probably the greatest thinker of the Church of that time. He could not say from what district he came nor to what school he belonged. It is commonly believed the book was written in Asia, but since he considered it necessary to break with tradition in everything else, it would not be wise to insist upon this.

The last edition of his *Introduction* flatly contradicts some of these assertions. The theory that the Fourth Gospel was written as a philosophical creation is rejected as an out-lived and one-sided view. It is a work, born of the needs of the times, throughout apologetic and for the most part an arrange-

ment of the gospel history for the purpose of answering Jewish objections to the Gospel, as it had been taught until that time. Juelicher's change of position is no less marked in the matter of authorship. He recognizes a close relation between this gospel and the disciple of Jesus that lived so long in Asia, and of whom we have definite information through Polycarp and Irenaeus, who was probably John, the son of Zebedee. An enthusiastic admirer of this man was the evangelist, who was inspired to write by the stress of the times. The motive principle of the gospel is shown in the following: "The writer could not be a child of his times, if he paid more attention to the tradition from John than to the needs of the hour. The addresses of Jesus are mostly his own work, and likewise his keen reconstruction of the account of the passion." "That which gave him confidence for his work, was the conviction that he could reproduce with exactness the picture of Christ, as he had received it from the Apostle. The result is that the book contains much that is subjectively true, and much that is objectively doubtful. The second edition also differs from the first in that it does not hesitate to mention the place where the Gospel was written. "Why should we seek this enthusiastic admirer of the Apostle elsewhere than in Ephesus, where this disciple worked so many years."

We see that Juelicher has made great progress in seven years in his treatment of the Johannine problem. But this has been the course of most men who have attacked the Fourth Gospel. Bretschneider in Tzschirner's *Magazine fuer Prediger*, of 1824, speaks much more conservatively than he did in his *Probabilia* of 1820, and many others have shown like development. It is easy for intellectual zeal to be destructive in its criticism, but prolonged contact with and study of this Gospel makes a man, to a certain degree, helpless before its peculiar power, and compels him, perhaps in some instances against his will, to believe that it had some very close relation to those who were near to Christ.

During January of this year, Dr. Hilprecht, of the Univer-

sity of Pennsylvania, delivered lectures in Leipzig and Berlin on the results of the excavations at Nippur. Among other things, he said that he never had received such an object lesson concerning the irrefutable truth of Old Testament prophecies as in the great fields of ruins in the earliest civilized district of the world, between the Tigris and the Euphrates. "On the basis of my fifteen years study of cuneiform inscriptions, I must declare the attempt impossible, which was recently made, to derive the pure monotheistic idea of the God of the Israelites from Babylonian sources. The faith of the Chosen People was: 'Hear, oh Israel, the Lord our God is one God,' and this faith can never spring from the Babylonian mount of gods".

This last statement was evidently intended to contradict Delitzsch's assertions in his much discussed pamphlet *Babel und Bibel*. Soon there appeared a statement, signed by Delitzsch and four other assyriologists, who were only his assistants, which on the basis of reports, declared false certain of Dr. Hilprecht's statements in regard to the amount of work he had done in this field, and sought to discredit him generally as a scientist. Dr. Hilprecht's rejoinder showed that their criticisms were utterly without foundation, and that they were not acquainted with the latest literature on this subject. Some journals plainly hint that it was a cowardly way of trying to cover up their inability to reply to him. Luthardt's church paper says that they chose the way of personal depreciation in order to discredit the statements of a fellow specialist, who made them uncomfortable.

The theological position of Emperor William has been quite uncertain for a long time. Both conservative and liberal leaders have in turn assured the public that his views coincided with those of their respective parties. But during recent years, most of the facts that have become known seemed to show a marked preference for the more liberal way of thinking, as represented by Harnack. In fact it is claimed and generally believed, that the Emperor, contrary to custom, though not exercising authority that was not vested in him, secured

Harnack's transfer from Marburg to Berlin, which was against the very strong opposition of the Berlin faculty. Recently, especially during and since Harnack's year of service as Rector Magnificus of the University, he has received the very highest marks of Royal appreciation; the Emperor has repeatedly referred to his great service as an investigator and an educator, and during the Winter of 1901 and 1902 he invited him to the palace a number of times, an honor which was not shown to any other member of the theological faculty. Of course all this gave Harnack great prominence in court circles, and led the general public to believe that his type of theological thought was preferred by the Emperor to all others. Then last year the fact that Delitzsch was requested to repeat his lecture on *Babel und Bibel* in the palace, after the Emperor already had heard it once, strengthened this conviction. And when Delitzsch delivered his second lecture on *Babel und Bibel* before the German Oriental Society, the Emperor was present again. All these things seemed to form a net of conclusive circumstantial evidence that Emperor William sympathized rather with the negative tendency than with the orthodox party in the Church.

Of course his opinion was only that of an individual, but it was the opinion of the first man in the Empire, and of course had great influence. And then, too, according to the organization of the Prussian Church, he, as king of Prussia, is Summus Episcopus of the State Church, which gives his theological opinions a quasi official importance.

Several years ago already, the people began to speak of "court theology," and it was taken up and discussed by the secular and religious press. Of course the liberal papers praised the Emperor's sound judgment and did not hesitate to say that it meant a great deal for the final triumph of the so-called "modern theology," to have won the Emperor to their way of thinking. On the other hand, the conservative papers openly and severely criticised him for having taken this stand, and did not hesitate to draw uncomplimentary comparisons between the present "court theology" and that of old Emperor

William I, who was pronouncedly conservative. Then when he honored Delitzsch's second lecture on *Babel und Bibel* last January with his presence, and when the lecture appeared as a pamphlet and informed the public on the first page that it had been delivered before the Emperor and Empress, the criticism of the conservative press burst forth with renewed zeal, for this last lecture showed no essential change in position from the former and was evidently intended more as a blow at belief in revelation than as a discussion of the relation between the Bible and Babylonian civilization from the standpoint of the Assyriologist.

During all this time the Emperor had not expressed his attitude to the questions involved, and, though the public were repeatedly assured that he was quite conservative, they remained skeptical. But this uncertainty prevails no longer. The Germans know now pretty definitely what their Emperor believes. Under date of Feb. 15th, 1903, he wrote Admiral Hollmann, head of the German Oriental Society, a letter which was evidently intended to meet this criticism. And he has satisfied his conservative critics pretty well. His letter contains some things that are hazy and others that are positively objectionable, but in the cardinal points, he declares himself to stand clearly with the orthodox party. He unequivocally expresses his belief in the full divinity of Christ, and describes his position as "diametrically opposed" to that of Delitzsch. He could also have added that it was diametrically opposed to his friend Harnack's teaching on this subject. He also dissented from Delitzsch's views on revelation and did not hesitate to criticise the Professor severely. Also in this his position differs just as widely from that of Harnack. Luthardt's paper sums the matter up thus: "At all events, the Emperor will not have a court theology that disputes the fundamentals of the Christian faith."

Under such conditions Harnack could not well keep still. But the situation was quite complicated. He seemed to realize that the rebuke that Delitzsch had received fitted him just as well, therefore in self-defence he must at least make a feint at

defending Delitzsch, and it must be done in such a way as not to offend the Emperor. The result was an article in the *Preussischen Jahrbuchern*, which for the most part was a skillful bit of dodging. However, he shows himself to be thoroughly in sympathy with Delitzsch. The episode seems to be closed so far as the Emperor is concerned, but the Babel-Bibel controversy has been renewed, of which more later.

ARTICLE X.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

IMPORTED BY CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

Nova Solyma the Ideal City; or Jerusalem Regained. An anonymous romance written in the time of Charles I, now first drawn from obscurity and attributed to the illustrious John Milton. With introduction, Translation, Literary Essays and a Bibliography, by the Rev. Walter Begley. (In two vols., 9x6; pp. xxi, 359, xi, 414; price \$5 00.)

These two well-printed, vellum-backed volumes contain the substance of a book of 392 pages of Latin prose and verse printed in 1648 but allowed to remain in obscurity for more than two and a half centuries. It was brought before English readers a few months ago with the claim in its behalf that an unknown work by John Milton had just been discovered. The skepticism aroused by such an announcement would doubtless have been stronger than it is but for the recollection that so recently as 1823 a Latin manuscript containing *The Christian Doctrine* was found and is now published as an unquestioned part of Milton's works. That the reviewers have not been unduly skeptical is evident from the fact that several of the foremost have already admitted the reasonableness of the contention made for the *Nova Solyma* by its discoverer.

The editor and translator states with commendable fairness the difficulties of the task he has assumed, though he somewhat impairs confidence in his judgment by the dignity he assigns (p. 76) to the Shakespeare-Bacon controversy. For ordinary purposes his translation would be worthy of all praise for its idiomatic and graceful style, making it easier reading than any acknowledged work of Milton either in the poet's English or in a rendition from his Latin. The translator is perhaps as fair as one greatly interested in the establishment of a theory

can be, and yet he sometimes indulges in unwarranted Miltonic words and forms. To ascertain just how far this is carried one should follow with the Latin edition at one's elbow. Opportunity for this to some extent is given in the copious extracts, especially the poetical, supplied from the original in an appendix.

Mr. Begley's arguments for the authorship of the work are drawn from the well-known sentiments and accomplishments of Milton, his Pythagorean principles, his pedagogical ideas, his fondness for music and his religious views. The superiority of the Latin, notably the verse with its striking imitations of the onomatopoeia of the classics, is vigorously urged in evidence. Several passages selected for strength and beauty are considered in detail. Many special words and phrases and even a few errors are cited as matching some in Milton's acknowledged works. When all these are marshalled together the array of evidence is certainly imposing. In many cases the resemblance does not need to be pointed out but is patent to any one familiar with Milton.

The argument is, unconsciously perhaps but inevitably, weakened when some of the opinions in the romance are traced to men of the time who were associated with Milton, as, for instance, some of the thoughts on education to Thomas Young, Milton's tutor. Ideas thus found in several writers were evidently "in the air" and Milton was less original in advancing them than he has credit for. Of course ideas that belong to a common stock cannot be used to settle questions of authorship. Neither must excellent Latinity be made to count for too much. In the days when Latin was still the current language of scholars there were many good Latinists. Milton had probably no more in common with the author of *Nova Solyma* than with *Du Bartas* or *Joost van den Vondel*.

The "Armada Epic" is an included fragment whose patriotic sentiments, religious sympathies and lofty style are greatly relied upon to prove the Miltonic origin of the whole romance. But its inconsistencies with Milton's thought and style as well as its resemblances to them must be considered in order to reach a valid conclusion. Compare the barbarous and meaningless designations of the angels, Architheus, Zatheus, Ergotheus, Mystotheus, Opsitheus, Autotheus and the like with the melodious and profoundly significant names of Milton's spirits! Can anything so weakly artificial be found even in the poet's least mature efforts? The author of the romance by a superficial mark identifies the classical Jupiter with the biblical Beelzebub, Milton identifies the same divinity with Mammon, "the god of this world," running the identification into so many particulars and fortifying it so strongly that it would seem impossible to have passed from one conception over into the other. Can it be conceived that the poet who makes Michael (Justice) commander-in-chief of God's host in another

work put the characterless Architheus (Captain of God) into the same high office? In the "Armada Epic" Terror is represented as an ally of Christ and his angels against the Spanish fleet; in Milton Death is not an ally of Heaven but an offspring of Hell. Terror's cave, located in the Arctic seas, has applied to it in the translation (the error is not in the original) the same words, "of amplitude almost immense," with which Milton describes the magnitude of the created universe. The laugh of Terror, which Mr. Begley finds so impressive, is a shallowness, a mere rhetorical device compared with the profound significance in the "ghastly smile" of Milton's Death.

A strong reason against the Miltonic authorship of the romance lies in its lack of unity. The story is a mere thread upon which are strung, with little regard to order or sequence, speculations on education, philosophy, poetry, abstract politics, religion and theories of worship. Many incidents of the narrative have no vital connection with it. Milton's works are the very opposite in this respect. *Paradise Lost*, even more than this romance, is a storehouse of human science and speculation, but it has perfect organism and unity. It would seem impossible to attain equal unity without the support of a life-long habit founded in a natural sense of order.

Could young Milton have discussed so calmly and distantly the subjects of religion and politics amid the fierce agitations of 1648 and the preceding years? Could he have written as if unaware that the themes on which he wrote were absorbing all the earnest thought of his countrymen? When we reflect upon prevailing conditions we cease to wonder that the book written for quiet times remained unread. The writer wishes, he says, "after the manner of Apelles to take his stand out of sight, behind his picture, so as to hear what the passers by, the critics, and the men of the age, might say about it." How different from the Milton we have pictured, if at such a time he could be supremely concerned about the fate of a literary venture! Would duty, to say nothing of impulse, have permitted him to muffle his words in a foreign tongue and to hide even the name which to this day is hateful to pretenders in church and state. From this point of view it would almost seem as if no Englishman could have written the book, just as evidently few Englishmen cared to read it.

There is a kind of mysticism, inconsistent with what we know of the strong-minded Milton, found here and there throughout the work. It is most noticeable in the discussions about sorcery, trance, demoniacal possession and loss of God's presence. For instance, the ideal character called Joseph and supposed by Mr. Begley to represent Milton himself, suddenly and unaccountably falls into deep mental anguish, because of God's withdrawal, and then as unaccountably, after a severe spiritual struggle is honored with an ecstatic vision. With Milton spiritual distress was traceable to its cause in some specific sin; his

mind was too healthy to torment itself with causeless fears; his interest and participation in public affairs was a constant antidote to the diseases bred by solitude. He never forgot the dignity of human nature; even when Adam and Eve came in penitence before the Almighty after their "first disobedience" their port was not that "of mean suitors."

This romance was doubtless known to Milton and used by him as he used many inferior books. As Shakespeare stood in the midst of a group of great dramatists and in a sense was upborne upon their shoulders, so Milton had the support of sound and serious thinkers, not all Englishmen, in his day. From this work we may better understand the kind of atmosphere in which the great Puritan poet lived and wrote.

But while we are obliged to dissent from the conclusion of Mr. Begley as to the origin of the work we are far from denying its interest and excellence. Though in quality below the standard of the greatest mind of the seventeenth century, it is nevertheless a worthy product of a grand and serious age. The whole is readable, but the parts are better than the whole, and it would be a pleasure, if space were available, to draw attention to some of the best things, such as the Bridal Song and the wholesome religious sentiment of many chapters. May the sobering influence, inactive for a quarter of a millennium, descend into the thinking of our day.

J. A. HIMES.

THE LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY, 1424 ARCH ST., PHILADELPHIA.

Meditations for the Passion Season. Translated from the German by Charles E. Hay, D.D. Pp. 238. Price 75 cents net.

This book satisfies the need of an orderly devotional exercise for the home observance of Lententide. Scripture readings, spiritual meditations and prayers, are here found adapted to every day of the Passion Season from Ash Wednesday to Easter. The book guides the devotions of the busy house father, and prepares the mind and heart of the family for the more stately public services of the sanctuary. Similar devotional helps for private worship during the whole year would be an incentive to family prayers, and a stimulus to spirituality, extending the piety annually compressed into the period of the Passion Season.

The work is a translation of the "Haus-Agende" of George Christian Dieffenbach. The prayers have been adapted by Dr. Hay, the translator. Appended is a harmony of the four Gospels on the Lord's Passion, giving a connected history of the sacred events which occurred during Passion Week. In the selection of subjects for meditation several instances of the repetition of themes occur.

The lesson for Thursday of the first week in Lent presents the Palm

Sunday topic; and the lesson of the Holy Supper on Thursday of Passion Week is preceded by a meditation on the same theme on Thursday of the second week in Lent.

While the treatment of the themes as spiritual meditations is chiefly for devotional exercise and personal piety, doctrinal bias is occasionally manifest. The meditation on the celebration of the Lord's Supper for Thursday of Passion Week, which is the longest meditation in the book, advocates the type of doctrine presented in the Formula of Concord, from which quotations are taken at considerable length. Oral reception and manducation of the body of Christ is taught. The sacrament is for the healing of the diseases of the body as well as for the nourishment of the soul. In the strengthening and preserving of the new life the bodily nature of Christ restores the believer's body, and the elements of the sacrament become "the medicine of immortality," according to the teaching of Chrysostom. The grosser nature of a resurrected body, or as expressed, in the earlier form of the creed, of "the resurrection of the *flesh*," was extremely pushed to resist the stern denial on the part of heretics of any bodily resurrection. A restoration of the whole bodily organism was taught, including a re-incorporation even of lost hair and the products of manicure. To effect restored bodily perfection the elements of the Lord's Supper were deemed a "medicine of immortality," the divine corporeal giving renewal to the human corporeal structure. Oral reception and manducation of the body of Christ is a natural concomitant of this extreme tenet of belief. Exegesis of all the words of institution and biblical statement concerning this sacrament furnishes no adequate ground for this view. It may not hurt one to believe this doctrine; nor ought one to be hurt, or deemed unlutheran, if he cannot believe it.

M. COOVER.

An Adventurous Quest. A Story of Three Boys. By Laura Scherer Copenhaver. Rung Prize Series. Cloth, 12mo. Pp. 405. \$1.25

The book derives its title from the admonition written in Paul Hillis' Bible by his mother, bidding him work only for "the highest." Indulged by his relatives, and with an undue appreciation of his own ability, he enters upon college life. Here he meets the other boys of the story, Alexander Bernheim and John Poddington. "Poddy" makes no pretension of goodness, "Rock" is all that his nickname suggests, but Paul fails miserably in his quest during his first year. It is only when he is made to realize his self-conceit and Pharisaism that he rises to anything like true manhood. Severe chastening just as a brilliant career opens before him, finally teaches him humility and submission, and develops within him nobility of character. The three girls who figure in the story are true-hearted and lovable, and reveal the influence of womanhood for good.

The author shows familiarity not only with college life, but with life in a college town as well. The story is well told and abounds with pathos and power. A good Christian tone pervades all its chapters, and the attention of the reader is held to the end. The book deserves a place in every Sunday-school library.

Baron Stiegel. By Rev. M. H. Stine, Ph.D. Rung Prize Series. Cloth, 12mo. Pp. 331. \$1.25.

Among the early Lutheran settlers in south-eastern Pennsylvania, tradition has preserved the name of Baron Stiegel to the people of Lancaster County. His strong personality and simple piety have not yet lost their influence in the community where he was known. But it has remained for the author to gather up the loose strands of history and fable, and weave them into a lasting fabric which pictures unimpaired the salient features of the Baron's life. The story is told in narrative style, without being strictly biographical, and contains a definite plot into which enter scenes of stirring adventure.

In these days which so strongly emphasize success in the business world, it is refreshing to find strength and beauty of character held up as the highest ideals, and the truth preserved that misfortune in business does not necessarily imply failure in life. The story of Stiegel's struggles, witnessing the power of the Gospel to renew the heart, mould character, and influence one's fellow-men, cannot fail to please and edify the reader.

STANLEY BILLHEIMER.

LUTHERAN AUGUSTANA BOOK CONCERN, ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

The Book of Ijjob. Translated and Commented upon by Emil Lund.

The author, who is a busy pastor in Marquette, Kans., has found time, amid his numerous duties, to pursue the study of languages. His linguistic tastes have led him more particularly into the domain of Hebrew, where he has wrought successfully and become a recognized authority.

The book of Job, sublime as are its teachings, is confessedly difficult of interpretation. Its text is sometimes obscure and its references uncertain. Our author, however, has addressed himself boldly to his task and has made his own translation, which translation, while it varies materially from the Authorized and Revised Versions and sometimes violates good, idiomatic English, is nevertheless a faithful and literal rendering of the Hebrew. The comments in the form of annotations are brief and pointed and are altogether practical in their scope. At the end of each chapter a summary of its contents is given in a condensed form.

The author is a "traditionalist;" he has but little sympathy with

modern critical conclusions concerning the authenticity and genuineness of Job. He has done his work well, and has given us a book which will be of service to the pastor in the preparation of sermons as well as to the devout student of Hebrew poetry.

T. C. BILLHEIMER.

GERMAN LITERARY BOARD, BURLINGTON, IOWA.

The Free Church System compared with the German State Church. By J. L. Neve, Professor in the Western Theological Seminary, Atchison, Kansas. Translated by Rev. Chas. E. Hay, D.D. Flexible cloth 8vo.

The Socialistic agitation in Germany includes among the principles and policies desired a Free Church as a spiritual agent to do the religious work inefficiently done by the State Church.

The merits and demerits of the Church in Germany, and the comparative efficiency and success of the Church in our own country, are carefully and wisely presented in this booklet by Prof. Neve. The differing ecclesiastical circumstances of the two Churches with their divergent customs and religious proclivities are stated with brevity and clearness. The effects of union and of denominational rivalry, of State subjection and independence, and many intricate questions of church life are well considered. Principles for practice in Church Polity and Pastoral Theology are suggested, together with much information given on the condition of the Church in Germany.

M. COOVER.

EATON AND MAIN, NEW YORK; JENNINGS AND PYE, CINCINNATI.

Beyond Death. By Hugh Johnson, D.D. Price \$1.25.

This is a work of practical type, and deserves a wide welcome. Though the title throws the reader's mind specifically upon the things after this life, the discussion is more comprehensively eschatological, and embraces the questions of the Messianic Kingdom, the Millennium, the Second Advent, and the End of the World, as well as Death, the Intermediate State, the Resurrection, General Judgment, Hell, and the Final Heaven.

The author's effort has been to reproduce the teachings of the Holy Scriptures on these great features of the Christian faith. In his introduction he notices, on the one hand, the present active propagandism of a misleading Chiliasm, and, on the other, the endeavor of the New Theology to discard the truth of the personal second coming of Christ as an event, resolving it into a spiritual and continuous process, and to make the resurrection mean simply each believer's rising at death into another realm of life—eliminating the doctrine of a redemption of the body, and of an intermediate state. The agnostic and skeptical tendencies of the times, minimising the supernatural features, call for such an emphatic

reminder of the teachings of the New Testament and of their practical value for the Christian life.

By full right of the Scriptures, Dr. Johnson holds the truths of eschatology in close harmony with the fundamental and all-determinative conception of Christianity as a supernatural redemption—a power in which divine movement and working transcends nature. He connects human death, the dissolution of the union between the soul or spirit and the body, with the fact of sin, or man's lapse from the law of true living in God and holiness. For vindication of the natural immortality of the soul he recalls the well-known rational arguments in which the wise and good have always fortified the hope of it, but finds the full assurance of it in the clear teachings of Christ, and especially in the Redeemer's own resurrection from the grave. The intermediate state, between death and the resurrection, he presents, in harmony with the Scriptures, as a state of intelligent consciousness—the souls of believers passing at once into rest and happiness with the Lord, and the wicked into the misery that is the penal fruit of sin. But by the same Biblical authority, he excludes the whole Roman Catholic doctrine of purgatory. The view that has received such widespread encouragement these recent years, that takes the intermediate state as a further probation, he regards as wholly unsustainable. "There does not seem to be any evidence in the Bible of an extension of probation into the intermediate state"—"all a mere speculation, an unscriptural and dangerous error." Our author clearly distinguishes, however, between such extension of probation there, and the continued developments of the faculties and powers of the saved soul. His statement of this invites quotation: "Though we do not accept the intermediate state as one of probation or purification, yet we may suppose there is such a thing as education and development. The best Christians are imperfect when they die. One-third of the human race die in infancy, before their moral powers are developed, while multitudes entering the spirit world, though in salvation, are yet unfit for the higher blessedness. This shadowy world beyond the tomb may be a state of developing energies, of ripening growth, of augmenting spiritual life. * * * What we conceive is that the Paradise-Hades is a school where under the gracious tutelage of the Church, holy angels and redeemed souls of high spiritual development, the weak, imperfect souls in their disembodied state, the boundless hosts of children and heathen who are saved, the vast multitudes born in Christian lands that are undeveloped in character, are disciplined and trained for that fulness of joy and blessedness which the Father has in store for his redeemed children. Does this imply that there is sin in this Paradise of believers? No, but inferiority and imperfect development. This is what we conceive of that state: growth, development, and the attainment of the highest and the best, in a perfectly holy environment; the soul separated from the earthly body with its temptations and impulses to sin, enjoying the vision of Christ;

the intellect expanding, the conscience growing more and more sensitive, the tastes refining, the affections becoming tenderer and stronger, and the whole being possessed by truth, dominated by righteousness and saturated with the spirit of God."

The rest of the topics are presented with the same loyalty to the word of God. The discussion throughout shows the author's mind to be at home in modern thought, but as soberly discriminative between its truth and errors. This excellent work shows the high value of this mental quality.

M. VALENTINE.

ATLANTIC MONTHLY, BOSTON, MASS.

The June number of the *Atlantic Monthly* will be a welcome companion to the Summer traveller as well as to the stop-at-home, for, as usual, it is full of good things. Its leading contributions are papers on "The Negro in the Regular Army;" "The Boston Religion;" "Changes in College Life;" "A Forgotten Patriot;" "The Cult of Napoleon;" "The Glamour of a Consulship" and "The Little Town of the Grape Vines." The fiction of this number is unusually attractive. "Chrystal's Century;" "The Atavism of Alaraaf" and "A Summer Morning" are all delightful. Arthur Sherborne Hardy's serial, "His Daughter First," is concluded in this number. Mildred Howell contributes a poem which is a gem. The book reviews and Contributors' Club are up to their usual high standard and they complete a most delightful number of this leader of all magazines.

The Textual Question in Acts. By Prof. Dr. O. Zöckler, of the University of Greifswald, Germany. Translated by Rev. A. Steimle. New York, 1903. Can be secured from Rev. S. Paulson, New Rochelle, N. Y. Price 25 cts.

All intelligent students of the New Testament know that for some decades of years the N. T. Manuscript known as Codex Bezae, or Codex D, or simply, D, now in the University Library at Cambridge, has been the *crux criticorum*. This Codex is supposed to have been written in Gaul in the sixth century. It has been characterized as containing "many bold and extensive interpolations," especially in the third Gospel and in Acts. Tregelles regarded its evidence as of very little value when alone, but of great value when supported by other ancient authorities. Westcott and Hort declared that "the text of D presents a truer image of the form in which the Gospels and Acts were most widely read in the third and probably a great part of the second century, than any other extant Greek MS." Yet as a matter of fact D has had very little weight in the formation of the critical editions of the New Testament, such as Tischendorf's, Tregelles's, Westcott and Hort's. But within the last dozen years D has excited extraordinary interest, stimulated in part and increased by the discovery in 1892 of a

Syrian palimpsest on Mt Sinai by Mrs. Lewis, and recognized to be a very old manuscript of the Gospels. Now the Codex D presents the most exciting problems of Textual Criticism, occasioned by the theory promulgated in 1894-5 by Professor Frederick Blass of the University of Halle, viz. that Luke put forth two editions of his Gospel and Acts—a longer and a shorter text of each, the second in each case being the shorter. The second edition of the Gospel and the first edition of the Acts appear in Codex D, and in other MSS. in reverse order. The result is that the D text is not a corruption, but is also right, and is of as much authority as is the corresponding texts of Codex Alexandrinus and Codex Vaticanus. In preparing his second edition Luke simply took such liberties as may be allowed to any author with his own work.

Blass bases his theory on such grounds as knowledge of time, places and circumstance, less refined and elegant style in the D texts of Luke and Acts, "marked similarity of diction in both revisions, that permits the identity of their writers to be inferred." Naturally such a theory would excite great attention. Some New Testament scholars hailed it as a veritable Columbus egg for the solution of the most vexatious problem connected with the textual criticism of the New Testament, the question about 1240 variants in Codex D. Other scholars at once opposed it, and declared that the variants of D are "entirely arbitrary alterations." There arose also a middle party, that acknowledges the great value of a large part of the D readings, but thinks that many of its readings are arbitrary additions. Professor Zahn of Erlangen finds the decisive argument for the essential correctness of Blass's theory in the following considerations: "1, in the concrete directness and unintentionalness of the facts recorded in the D readings; 2, in the real agreement of its statements with the expressions of the received text, and 3, in the complete similarity of the style of both paralleled texts."

The author of this pamphlet concedes that there may justly be diversity of opinions in matters of detail; but these do not shake the core of the proposition: "*In the Book of Acts we have two formulations—written by one and the same hand—of the record of the primitive Christian age from the ascension of the Lord to the arrival of Paul in Rome, and as the author of this record, in the one form as in the other, no other than Luke, 'auctor ad Theophilum,' can reasonably be considered.*"

The pamphlet will be read with profit by all who are interested in the question of a critical text of the New Testament, for it is now generally claimed by scholars that neither the Trischendorf nor the Westcott and Hort text is to be considered as the best attainable. It is thought that the former relied too much on the testimony of Codex Sinaiticus, and the two latter on the Codex Vaticanus. It is almost certain that D will hereafter exert a larger influence in determining the text of the New Testament than it has hitherto done.

J. W. RICHARD.